The Outlook

JANUARY 18, 1913

LYMAN ABBOTT, Editor-in-Chief HAMILTON W. MABIE, Associate Editor
THEODORE ROOSEVELT
Contributing Editor

A Holding Party? Extraordinary political situations naturally call for extraordinary suggestions. Probably the most extraordinary suggestion regarding the present political situation has come in the form of a full-page editorial article written by Mr. Frank A. Munsey and published in the several Munsey newspapers. Those who live in rural districts are acquainted with the institution known as the "bee." Instead of each family doing its own corn-husking or quilting or pig-killing, the families join in what is known as a "husking bee" or "quilting bee" or "pig-killing bee." Mr. Munsey's proposition is that the Progressives and the Republicans hold what might be called a "harmony bee," or more specifically a "bee" for the suppression of the Democratic party. For this purpose he suggests that the several States should send Republican and Progressive delegates to a "National Conference," with an equal representation from each party; that by means of this Conference there should be formed a "holding party," corresponding to what in the commercial world is known as a "holding company." The two subsidiary parties would remain distinct, but the real expression of opinion and the determination of policy would be committed, we infer, to this holding party, which Mr. Munsey suggests should be called the "Liberal party." Apparently this Conference would be in session for three months, inasmuch as Mr. Munsey says that that time would be necessary for the formulation of a well-considered platform. The object of such a merger would be "overcoming the Democratic supremacy." That, in Mr. Munsey's mind, seems to be the principal duty. To those who regard the Democratic party as an enemy of the best interests of the country, Mr. Munsey's suggestion will of course make a strong appeal. To those who believe that the policies which the Republicans and the Progressives advocate in common are greater in importance than the issues over which they are divided—including the issues concerning such matters as direct legislation, boss rule, and popular self-government—Mr. Munsey's suggestion will be alluring if not convincing. The Outlook is not at all interested in the defeat or the success of any party as such, whether it be called Republican, Democratic, or Progressive. In that respect at least it finds itself in accord with the growing sentiment in this country. Party labels and party names mean less than they used to mean. Principles and political convictions mean more. The old line of division between parties, which is largely determined by sectional feeling, tradition, inheritance, and temperament, is fading; and a new line is being drawn between those who by conviction and inheritance are conservative, and those who by conviction and inheritance are progressive, or, perhaps more exactly, between those whose conservatism is consistent with their desire for progress along individualistic lines and those who believe that progress should be something more than the progress of individuals. As we have stated it before, it is the line between those who believe in all that makes for a community of self-governing individuals and those who believe in all that makes for a self-governing community.

Uniting for Good Government We do not believe that Mr. Munsey's plan, although the spirit that prompted it is commendable, can be carried out in National politics. The conditions of municipal politics, however, are somewhat different, for it is much easier for the citizens supporting good government in a municipality or small community to get together than it is for the citizens in a great territory like that of the United States. Moreover, in the city the voters unite, or should unite, for efficient and good government. In the Nation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they unite not merely for good government but for the establishment and maintenance of certain political principles and a definite political philosophy. There will be held in New York a municipal election next fall. If the dictum of District Attorney Whitman is to be followed, and the citizens of New York City are to get the best possible government for the city, it can be done only by a union of good citizens working together for that result. If the good citizens are divided and the spoilsmen and place-hunters are united, reinforced by the promoters of vice, the advocates of a wide-open town, and the men whose whole idea of political duty is loyalty to Tammany, the victory of the spoilsmen will be assured before the polls are opened. The present problem is, How can the advocates of an honest and efficient city government get together? This certainly cannot be done by fusion between the Republican and the Progressive party organizations. The leaders in the Republican organization have been accused by the leaders in the Progressive organization of gross frauds; and neither accused nor accuser could with self-respect enter into a partnership with the other for the purpose of establishing an honest government unless either the charges are withdrawn and apology is offered, or the charges are confessed and assurances of reform are given. It is not conceivable that either event should take place. On the other hand, if either the Progressive or the Republican party organization makes a party nomination, it invites inevitable defeat. There are, for example, in New York City a great many citizens who are cordially willing and even eager to cooperate in a movement for an honest and efficient city government, who are not willing to identify themselves with the Progressive party. They believe very heartily in overthrowing the invisible government which in the next election will endeavor to retake possession of the city, but they do not believe in woman suffrage, or not in recall of judicial decisions, or not in referendum, initiative, and recall. What the city wants is a combination of all the people who want to overthrow the bosses, whether they are Democratic or Republican bosses, and are willing to discuss with an open mind, after they have got together, the method which will be most efficient for that end in New York City. What is needed to assure a victory for good government is not a party nomination, with an invitation to members of other parties to give it their support, nor a bipartisan nomination, with a division of the offices between the parties, but a non-partisan nomination joined in by citizens, not as members of Democratic, Republican, and Progressive parties, but simply as citizens who are willing to leave party issues to be debated in another field and at another time. It ought to be possible for some such non-partisan organization as the City Club, or some purely spontaneous and self-appointed committee, to call together a body of citizens in which would be represented, not the several political organizations, but the industrial, commercial, and educational organizations—and these not formally, but really—and make this the basis for a joint action, not confederate of political parties, but common of all good citizens. As to machinery, the Republican, Progressive, and Socialist parties might well lend their party workers to aid in such a movement without party disloyalty or loss of self-respect.

The Idaho Prosecution

There are two important questions involved in the prosecution and punishment for contempt of court in Idaho of Mr. Sheridan, the editor of the Boise "Capital News," and one or more of his associates. The decision of the State Supreme Court preventing the Progressives of Idaho from putting on the official ballot the names of their candidates even by petition is one question. The punishment by the Court of newspaper editors for expressing an unfavorable opinion of the decision of the Court is quite another question. The principles involved in these two serious public questions will be discussed in The Outlook with some fullness in its next issue. At present we may recount the facts: Oddly enough, the Idaho State election law does not in any way mention the subject of Presidential electors. The lists of Republican and Democratic electors were put upon the ballot under a provision dealing with the election of "constables and other officers." Nevertheless, the Court held in its recent decision that the electors were not State officers, while there are decisions of the United States Supreme Court declaring that electors are not National officers. In every way the statute was construed by the Idaho court so as to prevent putting the Progressive candidates for National electors on the ticket by petition in the way employed in many other States—as in New Jersey, for instance. The only way, therefore, in which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the individual citizens in Idaho could vote for Progressive Presidential electors was to write in their names on the ballot; and over twenty-five thousand men and women (for women vote in Idaho) actually did write in the names. It is not surprising that the Progressives of Idaho were indignant at this attempt to bar them out of privileges which Progressives exercised elsewhere. One of the offenses charged against the Boise "Capital News" was that it published a communication from Mr. Roosevelt in which he commented adversely on the decision before the election. The case differs radically from the court decision in California which refused to the minority and conservative Republican party the right to go on the ballot as *the* Republican party of California, for not only was the Progressive party in California the official Republican party by virtue of its numbers and official constitution, but there was no refusal at all by the California courts to allow the conservative Republican faction to put their candidates for Presidential electors on the ballot by petition, just as was done in New Jersey and many other States by the Progressives, while this was impossible by the Idaho decision.

James R. Keene

The death of Mr. James R. Keene removes one of the most interesting and one of the last representatives of a bygone but significant period of American finance—the period of adventure and personal prowess. Financiers like Mr. Keene regard the financial and industrial world as Drake and Cortes in their day regarded the geographical world—a domain full of wealth belonging to the strongest and most fit. These financial "operators" believe that any man who can beat off the savages and pirates is entitled to as much of this wealth as he can carry away. Such a man is not a creator but a mere accumulator of wealth, and Mr. Keene's whole career was practically spent in speculation and manipulation of the stock market and not in the constructive building of railway or industrial properties. At the time of his death he was not interested in the management of any of the corporations whose securities formed the basis of his fortune. In this respect he belonged to an entirely different school of finance from that of which Mr. Morgan, Mr. Rockefeller, and Mr. Carnegie have been the great representatives. He is reported to have said once in defense of speculation, in which he was a past-master: "Without speculation, call it gambling if you wish, initiative and enterprise would cease, business decay, values decline, and the country would go back twenty years in less than one." This is the philosophy of the manipulator of stocks, the promoter of corners. The recent decision of the Supreme Court in the cotton case is one of the clearest of numerous indications that the country has outgrown this philosophy and intends to suppress the practices of its adherents. Mr. Keene was an Englishman by birth, and came to this country when a boy. His family went to California not long after the days of '49, and he early became a speculator in mining and other stocks. His genius for dealing in stocks brought him into companionship with other great "financiers" of the period, and he came to New York and for many years was a powerful figure in Wall Street. He made and lost several fortunes, and, like many men holding his philosophy of business, was both a savage enemy and a generous friend. He was fond of horses, and for many years was prominent and influential in racing circles, on two occasions giving to charity large sums of money which represented the winnings of one of his favorite horses. While he represents, as we have said, a bygone period, his personality and career illustrate in almost a dramatic fashion those evils of finance and industry which the country is determined to eradicate if it can by regulation of stock exchanges, overcapitalization, the cornering of commodities, and the control of financial markets by small groups of men, all of which are fundamental elements of the school of finance to which Mr. Keene belonged.

Two Supreme Court Decisions

It is an interesting coincidence that just about the time of the death of Mr. Keene two important decisions of the United States Supreme Court were announced which, when read in the light of Mr. Keene's career, show very clearly that we have entered a new financial period in this country. The first decision is in regard to the dissolution of the Southern Pacific Railway combination. We have already reported the Supreme Court's decision that the combination of the Southern Pacific Railway, the Union Pacific Railway, and the Central Pacific Railway is in restraint of trade, and is therefore a violation of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sherman Anti-Trust Law. In making this decision the Supreme Court left those in control of the combination to redistribute the stock in such a way as to put the three corporations involved on a legal footing. The plan which the managers proposed for the redistribution of this stock has now been rejected by the Supreme Court, and the roads will have to try again. Geographically the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific ought to constitute one line, and some way should be found to permit them to amalgamate. We do not see, moreover, how any present law can prevent the present holders of the securities of the three roads from putting them up for sale in the open market and buying them in themselves, thus retaining the actual if not the nominal control. We welcome the decision of the Supreme Court in the Union Pacific case because it is another long step towards the firm establishment of Government control over railways and other industrial monopolies. We think, however, that it is also another distinct illustration of the need of some further legislation supplementary to the Sherman Anti-Trust Law which shall enable the railways to learn how they may do their constructive work legally. If we cannot have legal railway combination in this country, we shall inevitably have Government ownership. The second Supreme Court decision is what is known as the cotton case. James Patten and associates were indicted in the Federal Circuit Court of the Southern District of New York State for conspiring to organize a "corner" in cotton in restraint of trade, and therefore in violation of the Sherman Law. The Federal Circuit Court of New York held that the acts charged against Patten, even if proved, did not amount to a violation of the Sherman Law. The Department of Justice appealed on demurrer to the Supreme Court, and that Court has now said that the alleged acts constitute a criminal offense. The case is now sent back to the lower court for trial, and if Patten and his associates are proved to have committed the alleged acts they will be found guilty of a criminal violation of the Anti-Trust Law. The case has been in the courts for more than two years, and the decision of the Supreme Court will undoubtedly have a far-reaching effect upon the business of dealing in securities and commodities. On another page, in the "Poll of the Press," we call attention to newspaper comment on this matter. The comment seems universally favorable towards the decision, and indicates that it marks a turning-point in the country's progress towards greater honesty and integrity.

New York a Prey to Strikes

Strike after strike last week disturbed the industrial world in New York City, and the tumultuous condition of the workers emphasizes the need of making State mediation in labor disputes more efficient and authoritative than it is now. We hope to see the day when such a fair hearing and adjudication as lately took place in the case of the Eastern railway engineers and as seems likely to occur with the pending locomotive firemen's demands may be a matter of course in trade difficulties in the metropolis. There were large accessions during the week to the garment workers' strike described in our last issue. By a rising vote and a great unanimous shout the girl workers in white goods at two enormous mass-meetings joined the insurgent ranks. These workers number from twelve to fifteen thousand, nearly all young women (mostly young girls), and they are only partly organized. The head of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union says of these workers: "They are worse paid than the workers in any other occupation I know of. Girls on leaving school will be employed in a white goods factory at $1.50 a week. In six months they will get an advance of fifty cents a week and in another six months the same advance, and it will be a year or two before they can earn $5 a week. Their earnings seldom reach $8 a week." Miss Rose Schneiderman, who has been a leader of these girl workers, adds: "In cases where manufacturers charge the girls 35 cents a week each for electric power, the bosses make money out of it, for 12 cents a week each would pay for it. In many cases they charge the girls 40 cents a week each for the thread, yet this thread is sewn into the garments which become the property of the manufacturer. In printing offices the printers might as well be compelled to pay for the ink." Wrapper and kimono workers said to number about ten thousand also joined the strike, and other branches of clothing workers either have voted or are likely to vote for similar action. Altogether their united strikes indicate a general and bitter warfare, as productive of suffering as was the well-remembered cloakmakers' strike. The employers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

naturally minimize the struggle and claim that the employees are gradually returning to work. There have been riotous incidents between strikers and non-strikers or strike-breakers in which the police have had to interfere, but no serious or extensive violence. Similar disgraceful scenes have marked the renewed strike of the hotel and restaurant waiters in New York City. Their cause has been put under the leadership of the Industrial Workers of the World, and one strike leader is reported by the newspapers as saying, "We didn't get anything by peaceful means in the last strike, so we are going to try different methods now." Object-lessons of the folly and wrong of industrial warfare are plentiful just now in New York.

Motion Pictures: Safety and Decency

Some weeks ago The Outlook gave a full account of the ordinance before the New York Board of Aldermen intended to provide safeguards as to health conditions, danger to life and limb, fire risks, overcrowding, and other evils now recognized by almost everybody as existing in the present operation of the hundreds of moving-picture shows in New York City. A very peculiar situation has now arisen about this proposed municipal law. As originally offered by Alderman Folk, the ordinance did not touch upon the question of moral censorship because that function has been performed with reasonable satisfaction by the National Board of Censorship of motion pictures through a voluntary agreement between that body and the owners of the shows. Despite this purposed avoidance of the introduction of a question foreign to the actual, practical purpose in view, an amendment was adopted by the Aldermen directing the Bureau of Licenses to issue no licenses except when the films and pictures have been approved, by censors who may be appointed by the Board of Education, as not indecent or immoral or picturing crime in such a way as to offend the sense of morality or decency. Thereupon Mayor Gaynor vetoed the bill on the ground that in this country no censorship should be established by law as regards what may or may not be printed or published. The remedy, Mr. Gaynor thinks, for exhibiting bad pictures, as for printing bad articles, should be by arrest and punishment after the offense is committed. The censorship of the stage in England is quoted as an example to be avoided. It has even been asserted (we hope without basis) that the amendment was introduced with the very purpose of calling forth a veto of the whole ordinance. The Aldermen have referred the matter back to a committee. It would be a great pity to lose the undoubted benefit proposed by the Folks ordinance because of a mooted question concerning a matter important in itself but really extraneous to the object now directly sought. There is a genuine difference of opinion as to the efficacy of exercising control over the moral influence of the pictures; there is also a sincere disagreement as to the force of the Mayor's argument. But there is substantial unanimity in demanding improved conditions as to fire risks, ventilation, lighting, seating plans, and other pressing necessities. The wiser plan would be to separate the two questions at issue, carry out at once those things which are admittedly desirable, and throw open to public discussion the problem of dealing with the matter of taste and morals over which already a non-municipal supervision exists.

The Problem of Adrianople

Last week at London the Bulgarian, Servian, Montenegrin, and Greek delegates on the one hand, and the Turkish on the other, suspended their sessions. The cause was Turkey's refusal to agree to the allies' proposal that Adrianople and the Ægean Islands should be transferred to them. The Turkish official statement is as follows: "Whatever happens, the Porte is determined to maintain its attitude with regard to Adrianople and the Ægean Islands, in view of the fact that sacrifices made in other directions have reached the extreme limit." The sacrifices "in other directions" are Turkey's offer to transfer to the allies a large part of the province of Thrace and all of the province of Macedonia, and to hand over to the European Powers the province of Albania, which would be erected by them into an independent principality, though under the Sultan's shadowy suzerainty. In their agreement as to Thrace the Turks expressly excluded that part of the province in which Adrianople is situated. Except Constantinople itself, the Turks would doubtless rather part with any other of their possessions than with Adrianople. They cannot forget that for a century it was the capital of the Ottoman Empire before they captured Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stantinople in 1453, and that its location—about a hundred and forty miles north of Constantinople—represented then, as it does now, an impressive mark of the projection of their power into Europe. Nor do they forget that its situation at the confluence of three rivers is of strategic importance, commanding eastern Bulgaria to the north as well as Thrace to the south. Nor can they tolerate giving up a citadel where for over two months their soldiers have successfully fought and suffered. They claim that if they were to abandon the still uncaptured fortress to the allies, not only would the present Government at Constantinople be swept from power, but that a revolution and massacre would occur which would involve the Christians in the capital as well as all law-abiding Turks. Thus Adrianople remains the most serious obstacle to all proceedings toward peace. It may be remembered that no peace was made between the Russians and the Japanese until Port Arthur fell. The fall of Adrianople would thus ease the entire international situation. As to actual conditions in the fortress, it is reported by certain fugitives that the only food obtainable is bread, and that the rations distributed to inhabitants and to soldiers have now been reduced to a quarter of a pound per head daily! Thus the allies are content calmly to await developments, knowing that time is on their side.

What the Powers Want

Despite the suspension of the sessions at London, the despatches speak of an announcement by the Servian delegates of the first importance. This is that Servia, as a proof of her desire for peace, will remove her troops from Durazzo, on the Adriatic Sea, immediately after the signing of a peace treaty. This decision to withdraw is justly regarded by the Powers as removing the chief cause of what was feared might be a European conflagration, owing to the tendency of Servia's racial ally, Russia, to side with that Balkan State, and owing to the decision of Austria and Italy to oppose the extension of Servian territory to the Adriatic. Doubtless the legitimate economic and commercial aspiration of the landlocked State may be met more easily by the natural extension of its territory southward across a fertile and friendly country to the Ægean Sea rather than by a forced extension through a mountainous and hostile country to the Adriatic. Certainly one of the results of the Balkan war should be the definite placing of Servia on a proper economic basis; and the action of the Servian delegates at London, if confirmed by the fact, will do very much towards bringing about an amicable attitude towards that country of Austria, Germany, and Italy. The suspension of the sessions of the Peace Conference may possibly point to an intervention on the part of the European Powers—England, France, Russia, Germany, Austria, Italy. For each one has reason to oppose a renewal of the Balkan war. Yet each one hopes to gain some definite advantage from it because of that war. England, France, and Germany, as the greatest creditors both of Turkey and of the Balkan States, look forward, perhaps not so much towards any increase of territory as towards an assurance that their financial and commercial interests will be better protected than in the past. Austria and Italy want to see Albania become an independent state, thus benefiting themselves by excluding unwelcome interests from the Adriatic. Of course Russia's ambition is, as it has long been, to have the Bosphorus and Dardanelles Straits, leading from the Black Sea to the Ægean, opened to her fleet. But there is another state—Rumania, a small Power, to be sure, but also one to be taken into account—with its own ambition. This is so to rectify the Rumano-Bulgarian frontier as to assure a wider margin between the Rumanian railway to the Black Sea and the Bulgarian boundary. Rumanians have long felt resentment as to their own loss of territory. They are not unmindful of the fact that the victory of Plevna was chiefly assured by their troops, which fought side by side with the Russian, and thus determined the final outcome of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877; and that Russia rewarded this co-operation by taking from them the province of Bessarabia. Since then Rumania has sympathized with Austria rather than with Russia. Racially, there is little reason why Rumania should sympathize with Russia. Rumania is really a Latin state, sandwiched between two Slav countries, Russia and Bulgaria. If Bulgaria is to be increased by the Turkish territory now occupied by her, she will considerably exceed Rumania in size, a circumstance which further accentuates Rumania's desire to be compensated for her neutrality by some slight increase in territory.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The English Political Puzzle

Mr. Bonar Law, the Conservative leader in the British House of Commons, seems to be between the devil and the deep sea. When he was elected leader of his party he was one of the most pronounced of English tariff reformers. Now, "tariff reform" in England does not mean what it does in this country. There it means an increase, here a decrease, of tariffs. Some time ago the Conservatives, as a party, definitely took up the question of tariff reform. The principal difference between the party policy in general and Mr. Bonar Law's in particular, which he has recently outlined in a speech, was that they propose to submit the question to a referendum, whereas he proposes to refer it to an Imperial Colonial Conference. The reason for his proposal was, according to some, Canada's supposed readiness to make a naval contribution for the Empire's defense, in consideration of a preferential tax on food for the benefit of Canadian farmers. As soon as this was known, many English Conservatives raised two objections: first, that, to meet the demands of all sections of the party, tariff reform must be accomplished without food taxes, direct or indirect; second, that, if Mr. Bonar Law's scheme were carried out, the colonies would dictate the Empire's fiscal policy. These sentiments have now been given definite form by a memorial signed by nearly all of the Conservative members of the House of Commons. It expresses the desire that the question of food taxation may be removed from the issues to be decided upon at the next election, and, if any plan adopted by the colonies would involve England's taxing of food, no action should be taken until the country had again been consulted by a referendum or by a general election. The agitation among Conservatives and their diverging views regarding this issue have doubtless done much to give reasonable hope to the Liberals of a prolonged period of power. The by-elections of last year indicated some revolt against the Liberal programme of Irish Home Rule, the disestablishment of the Welsh Church, and the more extreme of the reforms proposed by Mr. Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer. The whole Conservative party seemed united, and promised to rally a number of disaffected Liberals. But Mr. Bonar Law's tariff reform proposal has upset all this. In his endeavor to be consistent with himself, and also to satisfy all the Conservatives, he has come perilously near the disruption of his party. As to England's traditional policy of practical free trade, the Liberals point to the fact that for more than fifty years no responsible English statesman ventured to propose a reversal of Sir Robert Peel's dictum of "untaxed bread" until Mr. Chamberlain began to preach protection and preferential trade; and that Mr. Chamberlain's argument of England's supposed commercial decline is now made untenable by recent statistics, especially those for 1912, which show the country to be commercially more powerful than ever.

Germany Still a Bogey

Home Rulers are jubilant over a recent event in the House of Commons. After some hesitation, the Conservatives had decided to propose an amendment excluding the Irish province of Ulster from the operation of the bill granting Home Rule to Ireland. When this proposal was discussed in an earlier stage of the bill, there was a wavering among the Liberals. As a matter of fact, some Liberals supported the Tory proposal. In consequence, when the vote was taken, the Government majority fell below seventy. But at the vote taken on the final stage of the bill last week, the majority reached the high-level mark of ninety-seven. The debate on the amendment was particularly notable because of the clever advantage taken by Mr. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, of an opportunity afforded by the speech of Mr. Bonar Law, the Tory leader. Acting as spokesman of the Unionist Ulstermen, Mr. Bonar Law had said that they would rather be governed by a foreign country than by an Irish Parliament! On this Mr. Churchill interpolated, "Germany?" Immediately cries of "Who said Germany?" came from the Conservative benches. Much boisterousness followed, and in it the amendment to have Ulster excluded was defeated. All of which shows what a scare can do! Last week the debate on the third and final reading of the bill started. About January 20, it is prophesied by the bill's supporters, the House of Lords will be discussing it. Doubtless the Lords will reject the bill. In this event, after a lapse of several weeks, the House of Commons is expected to repass it. In order to become law without the assent of the House of Lords, the Home Rule Bill

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be passed by the Commons at each of three consecutive sessions, with at least two years' time between the second reading in the first of those sessions and the final passage in the third.

A Rural Survey

In war, in business, in engineering, men have found that it is a good practice to get their facts first and then act. The churches are now discovering that this is true with regard to what they have to do. One of the best examples is shown in a series of rural surveys recently published. Let us take an example of a survey of three counties in Indiana, including thirty-two rural communities. One of these counties is in the northern part of the State, another in the central part, the other in the southern part. All these communities were distinctively country communities. If religion were measured by the number of religious organizations, these three counties would be very religious indeed. Ministering to the spiritual life of their people are forty-one denominations. It would seem as if no shade of truth were overlooked. The Church of God appears in three forms: Church of God (Winebrennarian), Church of God (Adventist), Church of God (Saints). There are two kinds of Disciples: the Disciples or Christians and the Disciples (Non-progressive). Over against the latter we find the Progressive Brethren. There are two other kinds of brethren—the United Brethren and the United Brethren (Old Constitution). There is the Holiness Church, and besides that the Pentecostal Holiness. Then there is the Millennial Dawn, the Amish Mennonite, six kinds of Baptists, besides denominations that are Baptist in practice but not in name; three kinds of Presbyterians, four denominations bearing the Methodist name, three the Lutheran name, two the name Evangelical. Of course there are the Episcopalians, the Congregationalists, and the Catholics. Finally, in name if not in spirit most typical of this whole condition of religious division and competition, there are the Come-outers. Under such circumstances it is not surprising to learn that one of the ministers in a village community declared: "I have taken in a hundred and thirteen members in my three churches, and thirty-five of these have come from the other denominations. I tell you, my denomination is growing in these parts." He could hardly have been more enthusiastic if he had drawn customers from a rival retail shop. Perhaps the height of this enthusiasm for competitive religions was expressed by the inhabitant who said, as reported, that "if the Methodist church were on fire, and if he should happen to pass by, and if there were a bucket of water standing near, he would kick the bucket over." This denominational rivalry is sometimes a matter of sound conviction. "A Baptist minister," it is related in this report, "preached to members of another denomination and then refused to take communion with them. Another minister could not take communion with his own wife." It must not be supposed that this spirit of strife is peculiarly a religious spirit! In that county where the denominational strife is most bitter there is only one consolidated school and only twenty-five per cent of the roads are gravel or macadam, as compared with eighty per cent in one of the other counties surveyed. This strife is also in proportion with the amount of religious intolerance. Some of the little churches have been established only because the larger churches had refused some of their members the liberty of holding and expressing their own religious views, or telling of their peculiar religious experiences, and had thus furnished converts to the traveling evangelists of peculiar sects. It is interesting to note that the rivalry is greater between churches than between Sunday-schools, and it may not be disconnected with that fact that the proportion of men to women in attendance at the Sunday-schools is larger than in the churches. "There is no record in these three counties," according to the survey, "of the ministers of all denominations of the whole county ever having worked together in any movement."

Some Rural Conditions

The prayer-meeting in the churches of these counties seems to serve a double purpose, religious and social. One of the reasons why the prayer-meeting is better attended in a country church than in a village church is that in the country there are not so many other avenues for social life as in the village. It also appears that those churches that hold prayer-meetings have grown in membership better than those that do not hold them. This survey tells how one dollar of the church's money is spent among the different objects, what the average church

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

member pays, what proportion of the ministers keep horses, the relation between the education of ministers and the salaries they receive, the relation between revivals and church growth, the connection between the amount spent on schools and that spent on churches. The indication is that in the open country, though the farmer is in better financial condition than the ordinary village inhabitant, proportionately less is given both to schools and to churches than in the village communities. It is surprising to learn that a very much larger percentage of teachers than of ministers have received training beyond a common school course—ninety-one per cent as compared with sixty-three per cent. The contrast is equally striking in relation to professional training. The survey includes the social life of the churches, showing that those churches which have greater social life are for the most part growing, as compared with those which have less social life. These churches are not, however, doing what they ought for the social life of the community. In the words of this report, "too many churches feel that they have done their duty when they have condemned everything around them which seems immoral." The figures collected and compiled show that there is a very close relation between the religious factors of the communities and the factors that are distinctively educational, social, and economic. We have here been able to refer only to the survey made in one State—Indiana—and that only casually. Similar surveys have been made in Maryland, in Tennessee, Missouri, in Pennsylvania and in Illinois. These surveys have been conducted by the Department of Church and Country Life of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions. The superintendent of this department is the Rev. Warren H. Wilson, Ph.D. The work that has been done under his direction ought to be done in various parts of the country. The fact that it has been done in this case with impartiality is indicated by the fact that the church which this survey picks out as an extreme example of the offenders against church co-operation is a Presbyterian church. A great deal of credit is due to the Presbyterian Board for the disinterested service it has been rendering in this respect. It has been fortunate in having the means by which to carry out the plan. Every country minister ought to obtain and study these surveys. Every one who lives in the country ought to know about them.

The American Forestry Association

The annual meeting of the American Forestry Association at Washington last week was marked by notable addresses by Mr. Fisher, Secretary of the Interior; Mr. Graves, United States Forester; Mr. Pack, President of the National Conservation Congress; Professor Chapman, of the Yale Forestry School; Mr. Hall, of the United States Forest Service; and by Mr. Gifford Pinchot, formerly Forester. All present were impressed with the fact that a new fight is now "on" for Conservation. Readers of The Outlook may assume that this paper has already entered the lists in that fight by the publication last month of Mr. Graves's paper entitled "Shall the States Own the Forests?" in which he showed that the National Forests, containing 187,000,000 acres of land, adapted primarily to the production of timber and including the head-waters of every important stream in the Western two-thirds of the United States; having standing timber aggregating one-fifth of the country's total supply, and undeveloped water power approximating 12,000,000 horse-power; having tangible assets only to be measured by billions, and a greater value, not to be measured by dollars and cents—the stability which they insure, by a continuous production of timber and water, to the Nation's industrial life—that each acre of these National Forests must be put "to its highest use in the light of scientific knowledge of all its possibilities." To such an adjustment he and we believe that public control is a fundamental necessity. This is specially true when we consider that protection of the larger streams' navigability and the control of floods, often more than State-wide in their extent and injury, are matters of National concern. Hence it is inconceivable that the surrender of National control should be seriously considered. While the States have many legitimate interests in the National Forests, the Federal Forest Administration recognizes fully all of these interests. But the States, which cannot resist the influence of commercial interests as effectively as does the Central Government, have now, through some of their representatives in Congress, developed a scheme by which the forests shall be transferred to State ownership. This, under the guise of States' rights, is simply a movement for the abandonment of public control. How long would it be before the several States would yield to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commercial pressure and the resources be acquired privately? As Mr. Graves says, whether private acquisition of these resources is proposed by all advocates of State ownership or not, such would be its practical effect.

Mr. Pinchot's Opinion

This is also Mr. Pinchot's opinion. He showed that during the early part of the nineteenth century the main purpose of our public lands policy was to provide a means for paying off the National debt left by the Civil War; that, beginning in 1862 with the passage of the Homestead Law, when "Uncle Sam was rich enough to give us all a farm," the great bulk of the rich agricultural Western land passed into private ownership; but that in the present period the public ownership of lands whose protection is necessary to the public welfare has become "the master policy." Whereas it was once easy to get together great private holdings of timber by the misuse of the Timber and Stone Law; or when the great cattle and sheep barons controlled individually the grazing on thousands of square miles; or when the business was brisk "of locating school-teachers, milliners, waitresses, and other absentees on public lands under the Desert Land Law"—that time is past. The timber lands remaining in the public hands are nearly all protected in the National Forests. The rights of the small man to the range on the National Forest take first place, and will soon on the open range, added Mr. Pinchot. The fake homesteader is discouraged. Coal lands are sold for something approaching their real value. Water power sites and phosphate lands are reserved, in the public interest, from private appropriation. And all of this work has for the single object—*use*—for the people's benefit. The forests are being properly used, and so properly conserved. Says Mr. Pinchot: "The bulk of the agitation for the control of natural resources by the United States comes from combinations of capital whose purposes could not be achieved if they were avowed." There are honest men, declared the speaker, honestly mistaken, who support the States' rights movement. But, as he quickly added, the movement itself would never have reached its present importance but for one thing—the success of the Federal Government in putting an end to land-grabbing in most of its forms. As, from the beginning, the burden of defending this Conservation policy has been chiefly upon the Federal Forest Service, that Federal Service is on the firing line now.

The Evening Study Hour

Should boys and girls be required to study in the evening? At present almost all schools, both public and private, arrange their schedules so that it is, or seems to be, necessary for the pupils to do some hard work of preparation at night. This, in the cases of children at day school, not only entails hard work in the evening on the part of the boys and girls, but also, to some degree, imposes work on the part of parents. Against this practice the "Ladies' Home Journal" has directed its extensive influence. In its issue for the month of January it gives two pages to the discussion of this matter by public school principals and superintendents and by a physician. The opinions there expressed are in general agreement with the views of the "Ladies' Home Journal." The physician, Dr. Winthrop Talbot, says:

> When the growing tissues are wearied they must be given a chance to regain tone and vigor, or they will suffer strain. The plastic body more easily suffers lasting injury than the adult body. Sleep is necessary for it. What are the conditions which induce sleep? A brain relieved of high tension, it is true, but also a body freed from active heat production. . . . Every young mammal normally toward evening will suckle or eat, but not gorge, then play a while—a natural diversion of blood pressure from the brain—and then settle itself to quiet sleep. With the young human mammal that should be the usual procedure. . . . So by evening study we systematically proceed to allow our boys and girls to follow methods of working which definitely defeat the purpose we have in mind—namely, that they shall be kept in the highest degree of efficiency.

One school principal reports that as a consequence of forbidding the children in his school to take home their text-books, "except in the highest two grades," it was found that the children progressed more rapidly and satisfactorily. Parents were advised that they could have their children devote the evening hour to reading on subjects correlated to their school work. Such reading helps the pupils to advance, but it does not involve the strain on nerve and mind that hard study in preparation for recitation and examination involves. This partly answers the question, How shall the children be occupied in the evening? A still better answer is that they may take their time for practice that requires not mental strain but manual dexterity, such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as piano-playing, or drawing, or craftsmanship of one kind and another. The principal to whom we have referred intimates that this attempt to end evening study will incur the hostility of most educators. We doubt that, but whether it does or not, it should continue.

James Dwight Dana

Yale is about to observe the centenary of the birth of one of its greatest scientists and one also whose influence and personal charm, like those of Silliman and Woolsey, are among the University's finest memories. All three of these men were devoted above all things to truth, and were quick to recognize iteven when it encountered preconceived ideas. Dana, for instance, was already an authority of National reputation on scientific matters when Darwin's theories became prevalent, and his position was widely divergent from those theories, but after careful study and thought he became convinced of the truth of Darwin's main contentions, and recast his famous "Text-Book of Geology." In making a similar reversal of position in his book on "Mineralogy" he wrote in the preface, "To change is always seeming fickleness. But not to change with the advance of science is worse." And to Professor W. M. Rice, of Wesleyan, who recently read a delightful paper on Professor Dana in connection with the approaching centenary of his birth, he said: "When a man is too old to learn, he is ready to die, or at least he is not fit to live." Again, he struck at pragmatic scientists when he said: "I think it better to doubt until you know. Too many people assert and then let others doubt." It was this loyalty to truth and high ethical conception that made up much of the dignity and beauty of Professor Dana's character. Many middle-aged alumni of today will remember Dana's springing and rapid walk—even at sixty his geological walks would end with the keen little professor in the lead, followed by a straggling line of undergraduates. They will remember also the delightful narratives of his adventures with the Wilkes Exploring Expedition, his story of the albatross, the beautiful coral collection shown at one special annual lecture. The early knowledge gained in the Antarctic and the Pacific, when he endured shipwreck and narrowly escaped the cannibals, was an introduction to a life of close study in natural history and geology. Dana the geologist has an abiding place in American science; Dana the man was kindly, delicately witty, helpful to young men in their work, quiet, and with a courtesy of the heart.

AN UNENTICING INVITATION

It argues well for the sincerity and earnestness of the political convictions of the American people that both the two defeated parties—the Progressive and the Republican—have held meetings which were for self-gratulation, not for self-condolence; both of which included, if not a programme, at least an announced purpose for future action. The Progressive gathering in Chicago was described in The Outlook for December 21. The Republican meeting was a great dinner, on January 4, given to Mr. Taft, at which it is reported that more than fourteen hundred diners sat down to a banquet, shall we say in celebration of the Republican defeat? The feature of this dinner was an address by Mr. Taft to his fellow-Republicans, in which he defended the policy of his Administration and defined the issue of the last election as he understands it.

We pass by without discussion his praise of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff; his renewed advocacy of the defeated Reciprocity Agreement with Canada, and the defeated Treaty of Universal Arbitration with England and France; his naïve claim that the Republican party had succeeded in its purpose because it averted the danger of Mr. Roosevelt's election; his guess that a million Republican electors voted for Mr. Wilson, a guess which assumes an extraordinary defection in the Democratic vote, since even with that imagined addition Mr. Wilson's popular vote was less than the popular Democratic vote of the party in some previous elections; his intimation that somebody unnamed wishes to repeal the Constitution and subject the rights of the minority to the unrestrained despotism of a wild and unscrupulous majority; and we pass on to the last paragraph in his speech, in which he defines the issue of the hour as he sees it:

> Let us invite those Republicans who left us under an impulse that calmer consideration shows to have been unwise to return and stand again shoulder to shoulder with us in this critical time in our country's history.
>
> Let us invite from the ranks of our opponents, the Democrats, the many who love the Constitution and the blessings it has conferred on our people to unite with us in its defense.
>
> It must be a campaign of education among

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the common people against the poison of class hatred, the fanaticism of unbalanced enthusiasts, the sophistry of demagogic promises, and the wiles of false friends of humanity.

We do not think that either Republicans or Democrats will find in this peroration an enticing invitation. We do not think that history will find in it an accurate interpretation of the signs of the times. To The Outlook it seems to indicate an extraordinary misunderstanding of this beginning of the twentieth century.

A great uprising of the people is witnessed throughout the world. China throws off the Manchu dynasty, to which it has been subject for centuries, and establishes a modern Republic in its place. The Balkan States rise against their Turkish oppressors and startle all Europe by their successful vanquishing of their ancient masters. England not only overthrows the Conservative party and introduces democratic experiments which have been tried out in some of her colonies, but also successfully carries out a radical revolution in her historic Constitution, by depriving the House of Lords of its ancient veto power. In the United States the same spirit forces upon the Democratic party an avowed progressive, in spite of the skillful maneuvering and the astute and stubborn resistance of experienced bosses. With no time for organization or previous purpose and definite education, an avowedly Progressive party casts a popular vote of over four million, making it the second party in size in the United States, and this it does three months after its birth. And in this great world movement Mr. Taft can see nothing but "the poison of class hatred, the fanaticism of unbalanced enthusiasts, the sophistry of demagogic promises, and the wiles of false friends of humanity."

The progressive spirit is immeasurably greater and more potent than the Progressive party. It is not improbable that there are as many Americans without the Progressive party as within it who are inspired by the progressive spirit. Certainly there are innumerable progressives who do not believe in woman suffrage, at least not until there is some adequate evidence that the majority of the women wish to assume the responsibilities of government, from which hitherto they have been exempt; who believe in the Initiative, the Referendum, and the Recall only as experiments and under careful guards and limitations; who do not think that any form of Direct Primary has yet been put in operation which is altogether satisfactory; who, in other words, are more or less doubtful about the specific plans and methods proposed by the Progressive party, and who yet agree with that party in believing that to destroy the invisible government which has become enthroned in American politics, and establish in its place a visible government directly responsible to the people, is the first duty of American statesmen.

These progressives will be lured neither from the Democratic party nor from the Progressive party by the estimate of their spirit and purpose furnished by Mr. Taft in his curious invitation to them. They will be willing to discuss the question of candidate or candidates; they will be willing to discuss the practicability of specific measures of reform; they will be willing to give due consideration to the question, What measures are necessary to protect the minority from possible peril by the unrestrained majority? All this is proper subject for debate. But they are unalterable in their conviction that the present peril to the American Republic lies, not in unrestrained majorities, but in irresponsible oligarchies; not in the people who are seeking equality of opportunity for all men and women, but in the corrupt partnership between dishonest politicians and dishonest business. And from this conviction and from the consequent resolution and purpose to destroy that partnership and re-establish a true government of the people, for the people, and by the people, they certainly will not be diverted by being told that they are actuated by class hatred, unbalanced enthusiasm, demagogic sophistry, and the wiles of false friends of humanity.

ONE-PRICE POLITICS

Some weeks ago we printed an article which described the irritations, difficulties, and obstacles placed in the way of the efficient conduct of a certain manufacturer's business by grafting city officials.

In this issue of The Outlook we print an article by Mr. Fosdick, formerly an official of the city of New York, which has been written as a result of that article. It is, however, not a reply or a retort, but an explanation, and a very striking explanation, of a cause—perhaps the prime cause—of the conditions complained of by the manufacturer who felt he was being driven from the city.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Fosdick is right when he says that it is the citizens—the merchants, manufacturers, and business men—who determine the character of the government under which they live. If they are willing to live under a predatory, grafting government, it is the easiest thing in the world for them to get that kind of government.

We should like to add one word to Mr. Fosdick's presentation of the case. It is useless for Chambers of Commerce, Merchants' Associations, or Boards of Trade to try to "boost" the city by mass-meetings, or advertising, or any kind of "patriotic" appeals while the conditions pointed out by Mr. Spillane and Mr. Fosdick are left untouched.

American merchants and manufacturers believe that honesty is the best policy in commerce, and they practice that belief, in our judgment, better than any other nation in the world. They ought to believe that *honest government is the best policy for a business city*, and practice that belief also. The trouble is that to-day they do not have this vital belief. The merchant who would not for one moment tolerate a single violation of the one-price principle in his store will tolerate the election from his district of a government official whom he knows will not deal equally with all comers—that is, who is not a one-price man in politics.

ARBITRATION AND PANAMA

I—A LETTER FROM MR. ROOSEVELT

The Editor-in-Chief of The Outlook has received the following letter from Mr. Roosevelt:

January 7, 1913.

My dear Dr. Abbott:

I believe that under the arbitration treaty of 1908 the United States is honorably bound to arbitrate the question raised by Sir Edward Grey on behalf of Great Britain in reference to the Canal tolls, provided the question cannot be settled in some other way satisfactory to both Powers.

I believe that the position of the United States is proper as regards this coastwise traffic. I think that we have the right to free bona-fide coastwise traffic from tolls. I think that this does not interfere with the rights of any other nation, because no ships but our own can engage in coastwise traffic, so that there is no discrimination against other ships when we relieve the coastwise traffic from tolls. I believe that the only damage that would be done is the damage to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Moreover, I do not think that it sits well on the representatives of any foreign nation, even upon those of a Power with which we are, and I hope and believe will always remain, on such good terms as Great Britain, to make any plea in reference to what we do with our own coastwise traffic; because we are benefiting the whole world by our action at Panama, and are doing this where every dollar of expense is paid by ourselves. In all history I do not believe you can find another instance where as great and expensive a work as the Panama Canal, undertaken not by a private corporation but by a nation, has ever been as generously put at the service of all the nations of mankind.

Moreover, I quite admit that it would be a difficult thing to get an arbitral tribunal which will not have some bias against us. Switzerland is almost the only community which has not some commercial interest in the Panama Canal.

Nevertheless, I hold that these considerations in no way affect our moral obligation to arbitrate the question if Great Britain so insists. It is to be presumed that we made the promise with our eyes open, and were aware that it might not be wholly pleasant to keep it. *I* was certainly alive to this fact. But the very fact that the promise may not be easy to keep is the reason why we make it with the solemnity attending a treaty. A promise to arbitrate is worthless unless we mean to keep it on the precise occasions when it is unpleasant for us to do so. Moreover, this arbitration must be, if Great Britain so desires, at the Permanent Court at The Hague, unless we are prepared to violate our solemn arbitration treaty proclaimed by our Government on June 5, 1908. Article one of this treaty explicitly states that "differences relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties" shall be referred to the Hague Court, "provided that they do not affect the vital interests or the independence or the honor of the two contracting states." It seems to me impossible to argue that the question of tolls on our coastwise traffic is one which affects either the vital interests of America or its independence or its honor. Such being the case, I hold that it is a matter of honorable obligation on our part to live up to that arbitration treaty in spirit and letter, and that therefore, if the question can-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be settled in some other way, we must refer it to the Hague Court for arbitration.

This whole incident illustrates well the folly of those Americans who a year or two ago endeavored to commit this country to general arbitration treaties under which they would have been bound to arbitrate everything. A general arbitration treaty is nothing whatever but a promise, and surely every man in private life understands that the whole worth of a promise consists in its being kept, and that it is deeply discreditable for any man to make a promise when there is reasonable doubt whether he can keep it. A merchant who loosely promises all kinds of things without serious thought as to whether he will be able to keep his promises is in grave jeopardy of losing both his fortune and his good name. The same thing is true of a nation. We should understand that the time to weigh, and to weigh well and thoroughly, the full import of a promise is the time when it is desired to make that promise, and not the time when it is desired to break that promise.

What is going on in connection with this Canal treaty now illustrates well the truth of this position. I have always advocated the arbitration of such questions as the interpretation of this Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. When I negotiated the arbitration treaties of 1908, I acted in accordance with what seemed the practically unanimous desire of our people, and with what certainly was the almost unanimous desire of the representatives of the people in the Senate and the Lower House of Congress. Now, when I made that treaty I understood entirely that under it we might be obliged to arbitrate questions where we thought that our side was absolutely right, and where nevertheless it was always possible that a court might decide against us. This is precisely one of those cases. We are right, and yet the court may decide against us. But, with our eyes open, we have agreed to arbitrate just such cases as this, and we must not now go back on that agreement. I believe in being cautious about making promises. I believe in refusing to make foolish and sweeping general promises which it would be impossible, and improper, to keep. But when we have deliberately and solemnly made a promise, then I most emphatically believe that this Nation should keep that promise, just as an honorable man would do as regards a private promise of the same type. Therefore I believe it to be the bounden duty of this Nation to arbitrate the question of the Canal tolls, under the provisions of our arbitration treaty. Faithfully yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

The Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott,
Editor-in-Chief of The Outlook,
New York.

II—THE OUTLOOK'S VIEW

Both the existing general Arbitration Treaty and the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty were ratified during Mr. Roosevelt's administration. His interpretation of these treaties, therefore, has a semi-official and authoritative character. The Outlook accepts that interpretation as conclusive upon the question as to how these treaties were understood by England and America at the time, and therefore accepts as conclusive, and makes its own, his statement that "if the [Panama Canal] question cannot be settled in some other way, we must refer it to the Hague Court for arbitration."

We think, however, it is better to settle it in another way. It would be more consonant with our dignity, and more conducive to peaceful relations between Great Britain and the United States, for Congress to repeal the provision for the free passage of coastwise vessels through the Canal, than to wait for the always uncertain results of an international lawsuit. We hold with Mr. Roosevelt that under the Treaty "we have the right to free bona-fide coastwise traffic from tolls," but the benefit to America arising from the exercise of this right is not sufficient, in our judgment, to counterbalance the evil that would arise to both countries from strained relations between the United States and Great Britain. We therefore reaffirm the conclusion affirmed in our editorial utterance of last week on this subject: "We believe that such repeal would be more equitable, more expedient, and more in accordance with the inalienable right of the United States to enact purely domestic legislation without foreign intervention, than would be the yielding to Great Britain's urgency for arbitration, however courteous that urgency may be and however generous yielding would seem either to ourselves or to the people of England."

Mr. Roosevelt's letter on the general subject of international arbitration leads us to add a statement of our own convictions on this subject.

We believe in international arbitration. We believe in a world court at The Hague

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the settlement of controversies between nations, somewhat analogous to the Supreme Court of the United States at Washington for the settlement of controversies between the States. We believe in substituting as far and as fast as possible the appeal to an impartial tribunal for the appeal to military force, not merely nor mainly because it will put a stop to the horrors of war, but because the world's experience has demonstrated that, with all its defects, law is a better means of securing justice than war.

But it is evident that in the present stage of civilization it is not possible to refer all international questions to such an international court. The American Colonies could not have left an international court to determine whether they should be free and independent, nor the American Nation an international court to decide whether Great Britain should exercise the right of search, nor to determine the question whether the United States should remain a united Nation or should be divided into two Confederacies. Nor could the Italians refer to such a court the question whether they should remain under the intolerable Bourbon; nor the Balkans whether they should remain under the intolerable rule of the Turk.

Experience has always proved that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to define with accuracy beforehand what questions can be and what questions cannot be submitted to such a tribunal. All definitions are necessarily vague and susceptible of different interpretations. However phrased, a general arbitration treaty is little more than an expression of a purpose to refer to an international court for settlement all questions that can be so referred when they arise. But the expression of such a purpose is not useless. With nations, even more than with individuals, the expression of a purpose helps both to form it and to make its fulfillment secure.

What, however, is now most needed in the interest of peace, and to bring about the substitution of the appeal to reason in place of the appeal to force, is not new arbitration treaties, but the creation of a public opinion which will make the reference of most international questions to the Hague Tribunal increasingly a matter of course. We agree absolutely with Mr. Roosevelt that "a general arbitration treaty is nothing whatever but a promise," and that "the whole worth of a promise consists in its being kept." Yet, when the question as to the construction of the treaty between Russia and the United States arose, there was very little endeavor to create a public opinion in favor of submitting that question to arbitration. Mr. Roosevelt and The Outlook urged that course, but were somewhat singular in doing so. We do not recall that any of the Peace Societies took active and urgent measures in support of such a policy. Whether they did or not, the urgency was ineffective, and the President had all he could do to prevent the annulment of the treaty being accompanied with language of insult.

In politics as in religion, deeds are worth more than creeds. In our judgment, the peace societies and the peace advocates will render their best service to the country, not by urging disarmament, not by urging revised treaties of arbitration, but by using all the moral force they possess to secure the arbitration of each international dispute that may arise, at the time when it arises.

The Outlook has here restated its own principles in its own language, without attempting either to criticise or to commend Mr. Roosevelt's positions. The reader, however, who compares these independent statements will find, we think, that they are in almost if not entirely absolute accord.

LETTERS TO UNKNOWN FRIENDS

A correspondent writes to me, saying: "Sometime I wish you might be interested to write in The Outlook about the disinclination to ask for moral advice, and about a man's disinclination to talk to another about such things as duty, right conduct, etc. It would seem as though a college professor would find it very easy and suitable to talk to boys, or to a boy, about good and evil, and that there is no more important subject to be found. Yet how often, when you see it tried, you observe the young men look down and grow sheepish, and observe a cessation of the spirit of intimacy that was there before. I fancy the Greek youths looked their tutors frankly in the eye when right and wrong were spoken of. Here we are all, minister and teacher, father and citizen, professing the same work—a better quality of manhood; yet everywhere we see this remarkable hesitation to go directly about it. One of the professors of ——— University was recently talking with me about the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peculiarity of college preachers who come to that university. Some who can make stirring appeals to men in masses fail in individual cases. 'But,' he said, 'Dr. Abbott has both kinds of ability. Boys will confer with him, and will return for other conferences.' It seems to me that you would render a very signal service if you would take a look at your way of doing this, and then write a few pointed suggestions to preachers, college men, and high school teachers on the necessity of direct moral teaching and the way to go at it."

I have published this letter at length, though not in full, because it will be quite as interesting to the readers of The Outlook as anything which I can write in reply to it. The problem it presents is a difficult one. I do not pretend to offer any solution. I can only make, for the benefit of parents, teachers, and pastors, such contribution toward its solution as may be furnished by the experience of one person.

I have long been convinced that one cause of the apparent failure of efficiency in the church is the diminution of pastoral service. Neither eloquence of preaching in the pulpit nor skill of administration in the parish can take the place of personal contact between the preacher and his people. If I had the time and strength, I would rather talk with five hundred individual inquirers who sought me out for conference than preach to a congregation of five thousand auditors who came to listen and went away, many of them to forget what they had heard. In these personal conferences the pastor or teacher comes in direct contact with the individual soul. He knows the doubts, the difficulties, the dangers, of the individual. He tries to meet those difficulties with his solutions, those doubts with his arguments, those dangers with his counsels; and he finds, if he is open-minded, wherein the solutions fail to solve, the arguments fail to convince, and the counsels fail to guide. He gets just what he does not get in the pulpit, the response of the soul, and knows, at least in a little degree, wherein he has succeeded, wherein he has failed.

The ordinary method of pastoral visiting apparently in vogue in our day seems to me of very trifling use. The pastor goes to the house, makes his formal call, and departs. He rarely sees the men; and not infrequently the women are sorry he has come and glad when he has gone. He has no right to demand their confidence, and, interrupted perhaps in their social engagements or their domestic duties, they are, at the time of the call, in no mood to give him their confidence. He perhaps establishes a little social relationship which makes his ministry on the next Sabbath slightly more effective. Rarely can he do more than this.

In college conferences the conditions are reversed. The student comes to the preacher. He comes because he wants to see the preacher, because he has some question to bring to the preacher, because at least he has some wish for personal contact with the preacher. The door of his own soul is opened, and the preacher, if he has skill and sympathy, may enter in. In this respect the custom of the Roman Catholic Church is much wiser than the custom of the Protestant Churches. In the Protestant Churches the pastor goes to the people. In the Roman Catholic Church the people come to the pastor; in the confessional he meets them self-prepared for the conference and seeking it at his hands.

At the same time, I envy the minister who is able to go from house to house and bring about, in this method of visitation, personal, intimate, spiritual conferences. I know one clergyman who frequently preaches in a university where I have also been wont to preach. Whenever he goes there, I am told that he looks up the students from his city, visits them in their rooms, and through these visits gets acquainted with other students as well. I wish I had his ability. I am sure that I should fail if I undertook to imitate his example. I should be shy of going to the student's room, lest I should find myself unwelcome, and perhaps come at a time when he was busy with his work, or at a time when he was enjoying some companionship that he did not wish interrupted, or under some other circumstance which would make the visit an unwelcome intrusion. I have, therefore, always simply opened the way for students who wished a conference with me, and limited my pastoral work in schools and colleges to those who, when the way was opened, sought an interview.

It is not enough, however, that the door of the room is opened and a social welcome given to the inquirer. The door of the mind must be opened, and, whatever his doubt, his difficulty, his temptation, or even his sin, he must find a welcoming reception. The author of "Fräulein Schmidt and Mr. Anstruther" puts this matter very well:

"For two years, from sixteen to eighteen,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I was earnest, prayerful, humbly seeking after righteousness. Then one day, when questionings had come upon me that my conscience could not approve, I went to the pastor who had prepared me, as confidently as I would go with a toothache to a dentist, and bared my sensitive conscience to him, and begged him to have my thoughts arranged and my doubts and questionings settled. To my amazement and extreme fright I beheld him shocked, angry, hardly able to endure hearing me tell all I had been wondering. It seemed very strange. I sat at last with downcast eyes, silent, ashamed, my heart shrunk back into reserve and frost. I was not being helped; I was being scolded, and bitterly scolded. At last at the door some special word of blame stung me to heat, and I cried: 'Herr Pastor, when my tongue is bad and I show it to a doctor he gives me a pill. Are you not the doctor of my spirit? Why, then, when I come to you to be healed, do you, instead of giving me medicine, so cruelly rate me?'"

A great many young people are kept from their pastors by the belief that their pastors cannot understand them and perhaps will not even try. In my pastoral work with students I have been aided by the fact that almost all the doubts which perplex them have perplexed me. I am constitutionally a skeptic, and also constitutionally a mystic. If to any of my readers this statement seems inconsistent, I can only say that most of us are made up of inconsistencies. I have never been able to believe anything simply because other people do, and a command to me to believe has always awakened my doubts. I do not think that any purely intellectual opinion is ever a sin. Intellectual opinions may grow out of sin, intellectual opinions may lead to sin, but an intellectual opinion is neither a sin nor a virtue. Sin and virtue lie solely in the will. The desire to know the truth and to follow the truth to whatever disagreeable conclusions the truth may lead is a virtue. The desire not to know the truth, the willingness to follow a falsehood because it will lead one in pleasant paths, is a sin. When, therefore, any student comes to me with a sincere desire to know the truth, the fact that his point of view is absolutely different from mine does nothing whatever to impair our fellowship. We are one in desire to know the truth and to follow the truth wherever it will lead us. A student once came to me saying that he had been a member of the church, but he had lost his faith—first in the church, then in the Bible, then in the spiritual life, until he did not know whether he believed there was a God in the world or a spirit in the body. I said to him, "If there is not a God in the world, you want to know it. If there is not a spirit in the body, you want to know that also. Whatever the truth is, let us try to find it out." I think he was surprised at getting such a word of welcome from a minister. And when we had talked an hour and a half, and I had given him my reasons for believing that there is a God in the world and there is a spirit in the body, he went away, if not convinced, at least with the door opened to him through which he might recover the faith that he had lost.

A third advantage which I have possessed, which the ordinary pastor does not possess, has been the fact that most of my conferences have been with comparative strangers. Young men and young women in a school or college will come to a visiting preacher with a freedom with which they will not come to their own pastor, just as a boy will often go to a comparative stranger with a freedom with which he will not go to his own father, and, perhaps still more, a girl will go to a stranger with a freedom with which she will not go to her own mother. The letters which in this way I am answering through the columns of The Outlook come to me from unknown friends, and they write to me more freely because they are unknown to me. Early in my college pastoral work I discontinued the habit of asking the name of the student who called upon me and quickly forgot it when it was volunteered. It is needless perhaps to say that the secrets in these personal interviews have been kept as sacredly as if I were a Roman Catholic priest; and though the letters from unknown friends are sometimes printed, the name is never given, nor anything by which the unknown friend could be identified.

The three suggestions, then, which I venture to make to parents, teachers, and pastors, in reply to the letter given above, are these:

Make it easy for any one who wishes an interview with you to get the interview. Count such sacred fellowship always as of the highest importance. Do not begrudge the time given to it, nor regret the interruption which it involves.

Meet the inquirer with an open mind and a sympathetic heart. Do not resent any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question of doubt or any temptation or sin confessed. If one comes to a teacher or pastor to confess a sin, it is because the sin is a burden. If we are to do anything for the one confessing, we must put ourselves in his place and bear his burden with him; we must get his point of view and share his perplexity with him.

Regard all such interviews as a sacred confidence, never, under any circumstances, to be reported to another, and not even treasured in your own memory. LYMAN ABBOTT.

AN ACHIEVEMENT FOR HUMANITY

EDITORIAL BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT

MR. ARTHUR LEE, a Member of the British Parliament, and incidentally a man who has always been a stanch friend of the United States, has recently rendered a striking service to the cause of humanity and decency throughout the civilized world. He has pushed through both houses of Parliament a bill dealing in drastic fashion with the "white slave" traffic, the most infamous and bestial, the most cruel and degrading, form of criminal iniquity known to our age.

This was not a public morality bill. Its object was not to reform the underworld, or even to cope with vice. It was simply a bill to deal with a peculiarly atrocious crime, to punish the most infamous of criminals, and to save young girls from misery so heartbreaking, misery of a kind so hideous, that it is hard to speak or to think of it without a shudder. Briefly, the measure permits the arrest on sight, or on suspicion, of all persons, male and female, who make their living out of the prostitution of others, and provides for meting out to them swift and severe punishment—including flogging for the male offenders, for the underworld is primarily a world of male criminals, and in this traffic it is the man who is by far the worst offender.

Mr. Lee is a Conservative, and in order to get this bill through he has for twelve months been working shoulder to shoulder with men of all parties, Conservatives, Radicals, Socialists, and Irish Nationalists alike. Americans, accustomed to the way in which the National Congress and the State Legislatures simply spawn bills by the gross, like female shad, can have little idea of the extraordinary difficulties which have to be surmounted in getting a non-party "Private Member" bill through the English Parliament. As far as I know, Mr. Lee's bill for the suppression of the white slave traffic is the only Private Member's bill of importance that has become law during the last five years. It was possible to get such a bill through only by securing the co-operation and good will of all political parties and by preventing the House of Lords and the House of Commons from coming to loggerheads. To pilot such a bill under such circumstances to a successful conclusion means a literally astounding display of energy, of judgment, of good-natured tact, and of sheer downright capacity for hard work.

One of the best features of the bill, in my judgment, is that providing for the flogging of male offenders. The Outlook has very properly protested against the whipping-post as an ordinary instrument of justice. But there are certain kinds of cruel and brutal offenses which are committed by creatures so beastlike that they can be reached only by being themselves made actually and physically to suffer. Wife-beaters come under this class, and so do the loathsome beings who engage in the white slave traffic. The immediate effect of Mr. Lee's law on this portion of the underworld was quite dramatic. According to the reports both of the police and of the vigilance workers, its passage was the signal for the beginning of a general exodus of the professional white-slavers from England, so that both trains and boats for the Continent of Europe were crowded with them for several days. It is generally admitted that the decisive feature in shifting them was the threat of the lash, the one thing they cannot stand. As the London "Times" phrased it, "By a happy provision of nature it appears that the skin becomes more tender as the moral sense becomes more atrophied."

Mr. Lee may live long and spend all his life in power and accomplish much, and yet never accomplish anything that will rightly give him greater satisfaction or that will represent a greater gain for humanity. He has made all good men and women his debtors, in whatever part of the world they dwell.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CRIME OF "CORNERING"

A POLL OF THE PRESS

LAST week the United States Supreme Court declared that the making of "corners" in commodities was a crime. This may come as a surprise to certain people who have been seeking to restrain trade, suppress competition, and monopolize the necessaries of life. Hereafter they may have to take considerable personal risk.

The issue before the Supreme Court was as to whether James A. Patten and his associates were engaged in an unlawful conspiracy to restrain trade when they "cornered" the supply of cotton available in 1910. The conspiracy, so it was alleged, consisted of an agreement among the defendants to buy from speculators upon the New York Cotton Exchange quantities of cotton for future delivery greatly exceeding the amount available for delivery when deliveries should become due. In other words, as the New York "Evening Post" says:

The defendants in this case had combined, in 1910, after a disastrous shortage in the American cotton crop, to obtain control of the cotton actually available on the market, in quantity sufficient ,to make them masters of the price. The purpose and method of this conspiracy were perfectly well known on the cotton exchanges. It had the result, first, of advancing the price of cotton from 13½ cents a pound in November, 1909, to the utterly preposterous figure of 20 cents a pound in August, 1910—a price never reached, outside of paper inflation days, since 1836; and next, through the virtual blockading of supplies, except at the prohibitive corner prices, of emphasizing the world-wide depression in the cotton-spinning trade. The operations of Messrs. Patten, Brown, Haynes, and Scales did not primarily cause the troubles of the trade, but they unquestionably aggravated the situation. To put the matter in another way, a vicious and brutal attempt was made to extort speculative blood-money from the misfortunes and necessities of the cotton consumer in a trying season.

Thus it was charged that by these means an abnormal demand would be created and excessive prices would be paid to obtain the cotton. This is "cornering"—namely, the withholding of foodstuffs and other commodities from the market. Of such a transaction the New York "Tribune" says:

Not a shadow of excuse can be offered for it with which the general public has any sympathy. The man who forced up the prices of food products or clothing by his gigantic speculative operations on the exchanges has been regarded almost as a public enemy, popular indignation being mitigated only by the belief that such audacious attempts almost always brought their own punishment. But now the public need no longer stand by powerlessly watching some Patten, Sully, or Hutchinson play with its supply of daily bread, trusting that in the end he will overreach himself. Unless juries are singularly perverse, the belief that it is next to impossible to secure convictions for conspiracies in restraint of trade is likely to be speedily shaken. Obviously, only the criminal provisions of the statute will serve as a deterrent to this class of combinations, but if the Government can obtain the evidence it ought not to invoke the criminal provisions in vain.

In sympathy with this, some of those who had thought themselves aggrieved commenced legal proceedings in the United States Circuit Court for the Southern District of New York. The ruling of that Court was that the "corner" manipulators were not engaged in inter-State trade; that "corners" stimulate instead of restrain competition, and that the effect of the "corners" on inter-State commerce would be only indirect. From this decision an appeal was taken to the United States Supreme Court, which reversed the lower court's rule. Any conspiracy, the Supreme Court holds, to monopolize the visible supply of cotton not only makes it difficult to obtain the raw material but also interferes with the movement of inter-State trade. The "Evening Post" thus summarizes:

Yesterday's decision takes ground very positively that cotton as a commodity was cornered, and that cotton is a subject of inter-State trade; replies that even if corners stimulate competition they do so through methods as obnoxious as the suppression of competition; and concludes by reaffirming the principle that people "engaging in a conspiracy which necessarily and directly produces the result which the statute is designed to prevent" are properly "chargeable with intending that result."

The Court's decision was practically unanimous, only Chief Justice White and Justices Holmes and Lurton dissenting from the premises assumed by the majority of the Court as to the scope of the lower court's decision.

The immediate effect of the Supreme Court's decision is, of course, to remand the case to the lower court, with instruction to proceed to the trial of the defendants. The Washington "Herald" remarks:

The men indicted must now stand trial, and the case will afford an interesting test of the criminal section of the Sherman Law. It is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worthy of notice that since, in his annual report, Attorney-General Wickersham said that the results of attempted enforcement of the criminal section had been disappointing, several vital cases have developed under it. The indictment of high officials of the Grand Trunk and New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroads was on the criminal side. Now the "cotton corner" case will reveal the potentialities of the law as applied to the speculation in agricultural products.

The New York "American" calls attention to the inadequacy of modern law in dealing with "corners:"

If Patten had worked his corner like a lone bandit, without a confidant or confederate, the Sherman Act—which relates only to *combinations* in restraint of trade—would, of course, be inapplicable.

Thus, the Patten case is chiefly interesting and important as a demonstration of the inadequacy of modern law in dealing with the ancient crime of forestalling. In the Middle Ages nobody doubted that it was wrong to buy and sell in the same market—with the single aim of raising prices and making money on the rise. Nobody doubted in those unenlightened times that making money by creating an artificial scarcity was stealing.

It seems questionable whether our modern enlightenment has done us any good in this matter. What is the use of a refined and complicated legal code if the net result is to deliver the public into the hands of scheming rascals?

The business of cornering the market in food and clothing staples is simply the business of depressing and destroying human life. It is the manufacture of hard times. It is the inter-State commerce of cold and hunger. It is more dangerous than burglary, arson, or train-wrecking. Why, then, should it be tolerated in a civilized society?

Is it not time for courts of justice in this country to stretch forth their avenging and protective hands in that vast armory of fundamental law where the weapons of common sense are rusting in the racks?

The wider effect of the decision is greatly to extend the scope of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law; indeed, the decision is regarded by many as the most important advance in the application of that law since the Standard Oil and Tobacco Trust decisions. With regard to this, the New York "Evening Sun" remarks:

This new application of the act runs in an entirely different direction from the rules laid down in the famous Standard Oil and Tobacco cases. There it was certain devices incidental to large combination and roughly to be described as unfair competition which were held to disclose an intent contrary to the act.

In this later case it is not a combination of business interests that is in question. It is a particular practice, that of cornering a market for a brief period of time with the object of dominating the market and obtaining the profits of a temporary monopoly.

In its decision the Court makes it clear that in dealing with conspiracies of this character it will look not so much to the immediate results—which, it is conceded, are often marked by a stimulation of trade—but to the remoter aim. A monopoly of prices, with all the evil resulting therefrom, was the ultimate goal sought by the conspirators, and for that reason the Supreme Court holds the acts to be in violation of the law.

The New York "Press" makes the following contribution to the discussion:

The Supreme Court, in an opinion that is as clear as crystal to any mind, finds that a market corner in commodities can violate the Sherman Anti-Trust Law as much as a railroad corner in traffic. It can violate the statute not merely by giving the power to control the market; not merely by buying up such commodities as are offered in the natural market; not merely by being "long" of a market, any more than "short" of a market; but by being an actual restraint of the market, in operating "to thwart the commodities from the normal current of trade, to hamper users and consumers in satisfying their needs, and to produce practically the same evils as does the suppression of competition."

Moreover, the Supreme Court's decision will do much towards strengthening the growing belief in the efficiency of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law, says the South Bend, Indiana, "Tribune," in common with many other papers, because "the action against Patten was brought under the criminal section of the statute, supposedly the weakest section of the law."

But there is another consideration—not only the existence in the law of the provisions now discovered, but also an awakening on the part of the community itself. Formerly, as the New York "Tribune" says: "The community in general did not think such speculation unlawful. The judges would have been reflecting the prevailing economic philosophy of their time if they had dismissed a complaint against cornering, as is shown by the fact that no such complaint was made, in spite of the moral indignation over corners."

The fact is that the *laissez faire* theories of the time had turned men's minds away from legal control of such business abuses. Those abuses were supposed to cure themselves under the stress of competition and free opportunity. Before modern transportation methods were invented, an English town was dependent on its local food-supply, and the law had to protect the people from the cornering of that limited store. In the last century there seemed to be no need of such protection, with the market so extended that the play of natural supply and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demand could not be greatly affected by a single speculation. It is only with the new centralization of business that the old dangers have again seemed to be vital to a whole community and not merely the risks of rival speculators. Then we find the law contains safeguards as of old.

So much for the decision's immediate effect as regards Mr. Patten and others like him; and so much for the decision's wider effect, as regards the Sherman Anti-Trust Law, and also as marking an awakened conscience.

But the decision may have another effect, and that is from the consumer's point of view. How is it going to affect the consumer's food-supply? As the Washington "Herald" says: "The problem of existence is becoming so acute for such a large element of our population that 'free food' soon must be a national issue." Hence the consumer asks: "Does the decision promise any protection against high prices? Or does it not? If we understand aright the following opinion, the New York "Times" is inclined to say "no."

Let us not delude ourselves about the relation of "corners" to the cost of living. Attorney-General Wickersham is reported to have said that "the problem of the high cost of living can be solved" under this decision; "the Government will be empowered to break up any 'corner' on food products that may be attempted." We fear that Mr. Wickersham's astonishing successes in his trust prosecutions have turned his head. The high cost of living is in nowise due to wheat "corners" or cotton "corners." Only temporarily, and at long intervals, and in respect to a very small number of staple products, do the proceedings of the "cornerers" affect the cost of living. The high cost of food, rent, clothing, and labor is determined by other and very different facts.

Nor is there the slightest reason why any man should be for an instant fooled by the pretense that trust prosecutions and dissolutions are going to reduce the cost to him of illuminating oil, tobacco, gunpowder, coffins, bathtubs, and other articles of human or household use which he is compelled to buy. There has been an intolerable deal of cant and claptrap in the public discussion of the trusts and proceedings against them. We shall come nearer to the truth if we get rid of all these delusions. The fact that the combinations dissolved by court decrees were formed and continued in violation of law is a sufficient reason for putting an end to them. It is sheer yellowness and demagogy to set up the false pretense that the motive of proceedings to enforce the laws of the land is the desire to ease the strain upon the pockets of consumers.

Other papers differ. In this decision the Attorney-General will find, they claim, a powerful agent for preventing extortionate prices for foodstuffs. The New York "World" comments thus: "In so far as the high cost of living is affected by criminal conspiracies in restraint of inter-State trade, the Attorney-General is undoubtedly right. . . . As Justice VanDevanter said, in handing down the decision of the Court: 'It may well be that running a corner tends for a time to stimulate competition, but this does not prevent it from being a forbidden restraint, for it also operates to thwart the commodity from the normal current of trade, to enhance the price artificially, to hamper users and consumers in satisfying their needs, and to produce practically the same evils as does the suppression of competition.'"

On this the New York "Evening Sun" speaks as follows:

A corner in any market is a highly exceptional occurrence. It plays no part in normal business operations.

From the point of view of the consumer, however, the decision gives promise of offering a real and valuable protection. The corner, or the attempted corner, may not occur frequently, but when it does come it is apt to result in a kiting of prices which hits the consuming public hardest of all. The disturbance, if relatively brief and infrequent, is widespread in its operation.

We think that Mr. Wickersham is entirely right in his estimate of the value of the decision.

"The Supreme Court's decision ought to have ultimately, if not immediately, beneficial result in reducing the cost of living," remark many journals, of which the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, "Patriot" may be taken as an example. This journal concludes that "as the Supreme Court holds that cornering the cotton market in order to demand arbitrary prices is a criminal violation of the Anti-Trust Law . . . it logically follows that an attempt to corner the market for any necessary of life that is a commodity of inter-State commerce, such as eggs, meat, and poultry, must also be a criminal violation of the Anti-Trust Law."

The New York "World" adds:

There have been many important decisions of the United States Supreme Court sustaining the Sherman Anti-Trust Law, but this decision comes closer to the consumer than any other. It is more easily translated into dollars and cents than any other. It comes straight into the home, to the things that everybody wears and the things that everybody eats.

Backed by a militant Administration at Washington, this decision can become the consumer's Magna Charta, his inalienable right not to be robbed by every gang of speculators who are powerful enough to prey on him.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE KOREAN CONSPIRACY CASE

A REVIEW

This article is based upon the following authorities: "The Korean Conspiracy Trial," being a full report of the proceedings by the special correspondent of the Japanese "Chronicle;" "The Korean Conspiracy Case," by Dr. Arthur Judson Brown; "The Situation in Korea," being selections from the official correspondence of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions regarding the difficulties that have arisen between the Korean Christians and American missionaries and the Japanese police authorities; the "Japanese-American" for December 1, 1912, San Francisco; the article by George Kennan, "Is Japan Persecuting Christians in Korea," in The Outlook for December 14, 1912; an official statement signed by twelve American missionaries in Japan; and several letters received by The Outlook, called out by Mr. Kennan's article, including letters by Horace T. Tompkins, E. W. Koons, C. R. Miller, of Tokyo, and J. Numano, Acting Consul-General of Japan. Mr. Miller and Mr. Numano indorse Mr. Kennan; the others criticise him. Mr. Koons was present at the trial described in this article, and Mr. Tompkins was present in Korea during some of the events referred to below.—THE EDITORS.

IT is not necessary for our purpose in this article to enter into the reasons which led Japan to occupy Korea. Its occupation is analogous to that of Madagascar by France, of Egypt by England, and of the Philippines by the United States. In each case the independence of the country governed is set aside, and the people are ruled, not by a government of their own instituting, but by one imposed upon them by a foreign authority. In each case the results have been beneficial to the people. "All intelligent people," says Dr. Brown, "know that the Japanese found gross abuses in Korea, an Augean stable of misgovernment, political corruption, and unsanitary conditions. They have achieved wonders in bettering these conditions—inaugurating great beneficial reforms and beneficial enterprises of various kinds." The Japanese occupation has been generally, if not universally, appreciated and approved by the American missionaries, whose practically unanimous opinion is expressed by Dr. Brown in the statement that "the Japanese were right, and the substantial benefits of their policy soon became so apparent that the better class of Koreans began to recognize them and the country appeared to be entering upon an era of peaceful prosperity." The Outlook does not believe that all people are, inherently and without education, prepared for self-government. It believes in the American occupation of the Philippines, in the French occupation of Madagascar, in the English occupation of Egypt, and in the Japanese occupation of Korea. In each case the governing power is actuated by mixed motives. In each case the policy pursued by the governing power is attended with incidental evils and with some acts of spoliation and oppression. But in each case the net result is beneficial to the people governed, and it is by this net result the question is to be determined whether the occupation is just or unjust.

But in each country there is more or less bitter hostility to such occupation. Some of this hostility comes from race and national pride; some of it from honorable men who regard national independence of greater value than justice, purity, and personal liberty; some of it from professional politicians who find themselves deprived of their old opportunities of oppressing and despoiling the people; and some of it from the innate inertia of a people unwilling to submit to necessary sanitary and police regulations for the protection of health and life and for the development of commercial prosperity and the general welfare.

In Korea, as in other cases of occupation, the governors are divided into two parties on the question how this opposition is to be met. They may be roughly characterized as the civil and the military party. The civil party seeks to conciliate the governed people by respecting not only their rights and interests, but also their sentiments and prejudices; to leave as far as possible undisturbed their social customs and their religious habits; to confine the work of government first to the protection of life and liberty, and, second, to the promotion of such education of the common people as will eventually make a self-governing community. The military party tend to regard the national aspirations of the people as criminal or leading to crime; seek to repress those aspirations; do not look forward to self-government as an ultimate result, but to thorough subjection and obedience of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the one people to the rule of the other people. This difference has been illustrated repeatedly in our own treatment of Indian tribes in this country. We call the one policy civil and the other military, because these are the words which we find popularly used for the purpose of designating this difference in policy; but the phraseology is neither accurate nor wholly just, since some civilians have been advocates of what is called the military policy, and some of the ablest advocates and administrators among military men have been actuated by the spirit and have pursued the methods of what is called the civil policy.

In Korea Japanese administration has oscillated between these two methods of dealing with the Koreans. Immediately after the Russo-Japanese War the government of Korea fell, naturally, into the hands of the military party. It was succeeded by the wise, humane, and statesmanlike administration of a civil government under Prince Ito. But wise, humane, and statesmanlike administration never satisfied either greedy politicians or fanatical reformers. Men of this stamp among the Koreans set in operation a campaign of assassination. In March, 1908, Mr. D. W. Stevens, American Adviser on Foreign Affairs of the Japanese in Korea, was shot by a Korean who claimed to be a Protestant; in October, 1909, Prince Ito was assassinated by a Korean who had been a Roman Catholic; and in the following month twenty-one Koreans, eighteen of whom were said to be Christians, attempted to kill the Prime Minister of Japan, who was visiting Korea. The natural result was an abandonment of the civil policy of Prince Ito and a return to the methods of the military party. Count Terauchi, formerly Minister of War in Tokyo, was appointed Governor. These assassinations, in which Christians were supposed to have taken so prominent a part, naturally aroused Japanese suspicion against Christian Koreans, and naturally intensified the religious hostility of certain Japanese of the lower classes to all Koreans who professed Christianity.

It is well known that under all despotic governments the police are inclined to earn their salaries and glorify their profession by discovering conspiracies on very slight evidence, and sometimes by inventing the evidence to substantiate their discoveries. This was frequently done in Spain in the most active period of the Inquisition, in Italy under the Bourbons, in France under the Second Empire, and is now not infrequently done in Russia under the bureaucracy. When, therefore, the historian reads of the police inquisition conducted in Korea, leading to the incidents which we are about to describe, he regards that inquisition with a natural suspicion. That suspicion is increased by three circumstances: the fact that, as the result of this inquisition, those brought under arrest were nearly all Christians; that approximately a thousand persons were arrested, most of whom were released after the preliminary examination, and only 123 of whom were finally brought to trial; and that the basis of suspicion, in some instances at least, was ludicrously inadequate.[1] Thus in one instance the students of a mission school were requested by the authorities to be at the railway station in honor of the Governor-General's passage through the town. Before the boys were permitted to enter the station inclosure they were searched by the police and deprived of their pocket-knives, and the subsequent report of this incident by the police authorities was that the station platform was occupied by conspirators, every one of whom watched intently for the opportunity, having ready his revolver or sword under his long cloak, but owing to the strict vigilance of the police authorities and others they could not accomplish their nefarious object.

Whether these police suspicions of a general conspiracy were well or ill grounded, the net result of their efforts was to bring 123 alleged conspirators before the Court for trial. Upon this trial practically the only evidence against the accused were their alleged confessions, recorded by the police and reported to the Court. The answer of the defendants was that in some cases no such confession had been made—that the confessions were fictitious; in other cases that they had been extorted from them by torture. No overt acts were proved against the defendants. No attempt appears to have been made to carry out the conspiracy. And, we judge from the reports before us, no evidence was offered to substantiate the supposed confessions. These alleged confessions included charges that the prisoners had received encouragement from prominent American missionaries, such men as Bishop McKim, of the

[1] Mr. Kennan reports that "the number in custody was 287, and of these only 151 were Christian converts," but according to Dr. Brown these figures indicate the total number of Koreans and of Christians confined in the various jails of Korea on all criminal charges. The figures given above are taken from a report of the trial issued by the "Japan Chronicle."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Protestant Episcopal Church, Bishop Harris, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and a number of other Christian clergymen of the highest and purest character. Concerning these statements in the alleged confessions Mr. Kennan says: "Of course no one believes for a moment that these gentlemen had ever given the slightest encouragement to the alleged assassins, or that they had any knowledge whatever of the aims of the Sin-min Society," a society supposedly organized for revolution. Dr. Brown well says that "the assumption that such men . . . had guilty knowledge of a plot to murder Count Terauchi is about as reasonable as would be a charge that Bishop Greer and Dr. Jowett had planned to murder the Governor of New York." No attention was paid by the Court itself to this part of the alleged confessions. No action of the Japanese authorities implicates in the slightest degree any except native Korean Christians. Of the 123 tried, 105 were sentenced to imprisonment, the longest sentence being for ten years. If any American missionaries had been subjected to sentence, our Government would have a right to make an official investigation; but it has no right to investigate the legal proceedings of a country with which it is on terms of amity, when these proceedings affect only that country's subjects. From the decision of the Court an appeal has been taken, and a hearing on that appeal is now under way.

On this state of facts, thus very briefly recited, four questions have arisen. Our judgment on these questions is necessarily tentative, because it is based, not on official records to any considerable extent, but on an investigation and comparison of unofficial accounts reporting the facts from different points of view. These four questions are:

Have the Korean Christians had a fair trial?

Have they been subjected to torture?

If there was a conspiracy, was the Christian Church in any way responsible for it?

If there was not a conspiracy, is the prosecution a form of religious persecution of Christians by pagans?

We consider these questions separately.

The trial was not conducted according to Anglo-Saxon methods of judicial procedure. The accused had little opportunity to consult with their counsel, and the counsel little opportunity to consult the records of the confessions on which the prosecution relied. The trial was conducted according to French rather than English and American methods. The accused were interrogated by the Court, their confessions read to them, and they were cross-examined on those confessions, and, according to one witness who was present at the trial, the bias of the Court against the prisoners was unmistakable and unconcealed; the attitude of the Court was not that of an impartial judge, but that of a prosecutor.

But the chief objection to the trial is not the form of procedure. The chief objection is that the prisoners were denied substantial justice. And this objection seems to The Outlook to be well taken. The Japanese lawyers employed by the defense vigorously denounced the action of the Court. Their denunciation has been supported by some of the prominent leaders of public opinion in Japan. Their indignation was so great that they lodged a protest against the Court and demanded a retrial of the case before other judges on the ground that the Court was so prejudiced against the accused as to make a fair trial impossible. The chief ground on which their protest was based was the refusal of the Court to hear witnesses whom the counsel for the defense sought to introduce to prove that the alleged confessions, which the accused either denied they had made or declared they had made under torture, were not in accordance with the facts. Some of the evidence which the Court thus refused to hear we lay before our readers, as it is reported to us by one of our correspondents:

Baron Yun's "confession" alleges him to be in Seoul for meetings at Im's house on certain three dates, while documentary proof of school and Sunday-school records shows him to have been in Songdo on those days, with no possibility of reaching Seoul.

Pastor Yang Chun Pack was in Kirats San for a Bible class of seven days when his "confession" places him in Syen Chun, and in Seoul for twenty-five days when his "confession" places him in Syen Chun.

Elder An Choon, whose "confession" alleges him to have gone to the station for the purpose of assassination, and to have attended meetings in Syen Chun on certain dates, was, as the Rev. Mr. Lampe's diary shows, with Mr. Lampe on an itinerating trip in the country on all of those dates.

Teacher Kil Chin Hyung, son of Pastor Kil of Pyeng Yang, whose "confession," given, he testified, under torture, after two months of denial, makes him state that he went

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Syen Chun and Eui Ju on certain dates, was in college in Pyeng Yang on those dates, as shown by the records of Dr. Baird and Mr. Billings.

Elder Chung Ik No's "confession" places him at the station in Pyeng Yang for the purpose of assassination on a day and at an hour when the minutes of the Church session show him to have been at a session meeting in the Library Building, where he made a motion and was appointed on a committee.

A Syen Chun student's "confession" says that he went to the station, but before the Court he asserts he was sick with typhoid fever for a month at that time. Dr. Sharrock's hospital records confirm this and show visits made to him there.

Yi Sung Hoon and An Tai Kuk produced telegrams and hotel registers to show that they were in Pyeng Yang and Seoul when the procurator asserts they were in Syen Chun.

Pastor Cho Tek Chan's "confession" places him in Syen Chun, but before the Court he testified that on those dates he was in another county preaching, and that hundreds who heard him could support that testimony.

Such witnesses would have been heard as a matter of course in any Anglo-Saxon court of justice. The refusal to hear them is said by Mr. Kennan to be in accordance with Japanese law. The Japanese counsel for the defense, we understand, deny that it was in accordance with Japanese law. But if these Japanese lawyers are in error and Mr. Kennan is correct, the fact would not make the refusal of the Court to hear these witnesses just.

We agree with Mr. Kennan that to the question whether the Christian converts were tortured "no positive and unqualified answer can be given. Torture is forbidden by Japanese law; but that does not prove that it is never practiced. Torture is forbidden by Russian law, and Russian political prisoners have often been tortured by their jailers." But Mr. Kennan might have found an illustration nearer home. It is a well-settled principle of Anglo-Saxon law that no accused person can be required to testify against himself, and this principle is recognized in all public judicial proceedings. The prosecutor cannot put the accused upon the stand against his will and cross-examine him. We ourselves think that it would be well for American law to depart from the Anglo-Saxon precedents, and provide for an open examination of the accused by a properly constituted magistrate, an examination to be guarded against abuse by the presence before the magistrate of some legal representative of the accused; and we think that if the accused refused to submit to such an examination, that refusal should be reported to the jury when he comes to be tried, and the jury should take the refusal into account in forming their judgment as to his guilt or innocence. Because Anglo-Saxon law does not provide for this natural, normal, and guarded method of examining prisoners, the police have instituted an unguarded, an unprotected, and an illegal method of examining them, which is popularly known as "the third degree." Professor Hugo Münsterberg's indictment of the third degree is none too severe: "There are no longer any thumbscrews, but the lower orders of the police have still uncounted means to make the prisoner's life uncomfortable and perhaps intolerable, and to break down his energy. A rat put secretly into a woman's cell may exhaust her nervous system and her inner strength till she is unable to stick to her story. The dazzling light and the cold water hose and the secret blow seem still to serve, even if nine-tenths of the newspaper stories of the 'third degree' are exaggerated. Worst of all are the brutal shocks given with fiendish cruelty to the terrified imagination of the suspect."

We have great respect for the Japanese nation, we have great admiration for the Japanese character and the wonderful development and achievements of the Japanese people. But if the police in an American city, subject to the full light of newspaper publicity, can perpetrate, in spite of law, the acts of injustice which they frequently perpetrate upon defenseless prisoners, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Japanese police, determined to substantiate the charge of conspiracy, and able to carry on their secret examinations without the hazard of publicity, and to do this in a foreign country where they are comparatively free from the public opinion of their own people—it is, we say, not unreasonable to suppose that they will adopt a method of "third degree" in which they will not scruple to supplement mental torture with physical torture. That they have been accustomed to do so in Korea is testified to by one of our correspondents in a letter from which we make the following extract:

"Here in Korea for the past few years

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every prisoner suspected of political crime is, as a routine matter, put through physical torture quite correctly described by De —— in the 'Japan Chronicle' article. I spent six months in Seoul during the past winter and was in very close touch with the one hundred or more imprisoned Christians. Every few days I received exact information as to what prisoners were then being tortured and the variety of pain inflicted, and whether or not said prisoners had been forced to confess. Some days I received information from men imprisoned for theft or other offenses, who had been released. I also talked personally with quite a number of released prisoners who had suffered various methods of torture. I have not space to write of these except to state that they are exceedingly ingenious, carefully devised to inflict the maximum of pain while leaving the minimum of external marks to show for it—mostly stretching of the joints, tendons, and ligaments. As a result the joints are frequently dislocated and paralysis of various muscles results from over-stretching of nerves. But no marks externally."

There is not the least reason to suppose that the Christian churches in Korea or the Christian missionaries had any part in any revolutionary movement, if any such movement existed. That some of the Korean Christians and even some American Christians may have sympathized with the revolutionary spirit is entirely possible. That any American Christians sympathized with schemes of assassination is entirely incredible.

Yet it is not difficult to understand how an impression that the Christian Church was a revolutionary body might easily make headway among certain classes of the Japanese. In many Korean villages the Christian Church is the principal assembly hall of the village. In many a Korean village a religious meeting for worship and instruction is the only important meeting of the week. Buddhists, whose worship is personal, individual, and meditative, might well be unable to understand a religious worship which is congregational and is accompanied with public addresses. Such hymns as

"Onward, Christian soldiers,
Marching as to war,"

or

"Stand up, stand up for Jesus,
Ye soldiers of the Cross,"

might easily be, and in fact were, misunderstood for military hymns. In one case the story of David and Goliath was taken to be a parabolic exhortation to the Koreans to fight valiantly for their rights. Even the prayer, "Thy kingdom come on earth," could easily be misconstrued, as reported by a spy to a policeman, and interpreted by both without any spiritual comprehension of its meaning. It is said in one case to have formed the basis of a charge of inciting to revolt.

We think that Mr. Kennan has conclusively shown in his article that the Japanese are not conducting and have no intention to conduct any persecution against the Christian Church. Liberty of worship is as well established in Japan as in America, and is intended for Japanese colonies or dependencies by the Japanese Government as it is intended for American colonies or dependencies by the American Government. But it by no means follows that there was no persecuting spirit in this prosecution of the Korean Christians. The spirit of religious liberty has not yet filtered down from the higher circles so as completely to possess the common people and make police authorities immune from religious prejudices.

We have tried here to tell as fairly and fully as is possible within the limitation of a single article the facts respecting the Korean Conspiracy Trial, and to answer with frankness the questions to which that trial has given rise in the minds of those who have made any inquiry into the facts, and we repeat what we said in The Outlook of November 9, 1912: "There appear to us to be two perils involved in this situation: one, the peril to individual Christian ministers who may be unjustly condemned because of natural, though perhaps groundless, suspicions; the other, the peril to amicable relations between Japan and the United States, which might easily be aggravated if unscrupulous journals were to lay hold on the facts which we have here stated, and, by misrepresentation or partial and imperfect representation take the occasion to inflame American prejudice against Japan." We hope and trust that the Japanese Government will realize that its own national honor is involved in this case, and that it will take such course in the premises as will give the American people assurances that the rights of the humblest subjects in its dependencies will be protected with scrupulous justice, a protection not less adequate than would be accorded to its own citizens in Japan or to a citizen of any other civilized country under similar conditions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STRICKEN TURKEY

CONSTANTINOPLE IN THE HOUR OF DEFEAT

BY ALBERT EDWARDS

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT OF THE OUTLOOK IN THE BALKANS

IT is very hard not to hate the Turks, but it is impossible not to pity them.

Saint Sophia, the most famous building here, is to-day a pest-house. The stricken soldiers coming back from the first defeats, footsore from their rotten boots, half-starved, often wounded, finding that the authorities had made no provision for them, took refuge in the mosques. Cholera came to add its horror to dysentery and typhoid. The entrances to Saint Sophia are guarded by sentries who will allow no one to leave, no European to enter.

This is one reason which makes it easy to hate the Turks. All sorts of official obstruction have been put in the way of European effort to succor the miserable remnant of the First Army. The horrors of the cholera camp at San Stefano have been fully reported. Turkish officials had not lifted a finger to bury the dead, to ease the dying, or to cure the sick. At last a Swedish governess began work there. She was quickly seconded by a Scotch missionary, an English newspaper man, and two Americans—Mr. Philip, the first secretary of our Embassy, and Major Wood. But this little band of heroes, who have brought some order into the inferno, have received the most grudging help from the Turks and not a little interference.

Although the Aya Sophia and the mosques of Ahmed and Suleiman are closed, I was able, by staring a sentry out of countenance, to get into the Mosque of Bayazid. There is no cholera there, as far as I could see—only the wounded. But the conditions were certainly horrible. The men who were able to sit up sat around in little groups, silent, motionless—as if they were waiting for something. There were no sanitary arrangements. Some of the men had been in the building for weeks. There were no doctors in sight, not even a nurse. Above the stench of the filth was the pungent, sickening odor of gangrene. One man told me that his wound had not been dressed for eighteen days. Even an amputation would not save him now. All with whom I spoke were hungry.

Half a dozen hospitals have been opened by the European colony. None, I think, is full. One is entirely empty. Official Turkish pride prefers to see the soldiers die of neglect rather than have them helped by foreigners. Yes. It is very hard not to hate the Turks.

Yet I find it impossible not to feel sorry for a young friend of mine, Hussein Ali Bey. Early in the spring of 1908 I went to a lecture at "*l Ecole d'haute science politique*" at Paris. The speaker, who was a noted diplomat, addressed us on "The Near East." After the lecture was over an elegantly dressed young man, who wore a tarboosh and who had sat beside me, said:

"I hope you did not believe all he said."

So began my acquaintance with Hussein Ali Bey—and with the expression "Young Turk." He was an amiable fellow, still in his teens. His father, who had been a provincial governor, had been exiled by Abd-ul-Hamid, and Hussein had been educated in France. I saw a good deal of him that spring. What impressed me most was his dreamy disregard of practical matters. If ever a man trod the clouds, it was Hussein. I was fresh from the bloody tragedy of Young Russia's effort to win freedom, and I could not share his optimism. I remember one evening he recited to me a poem he had written on "Liberty." It might, as far as its spirit went, have been written by Tolstoy. It was all of brotherhood and love. Evidently he had read history very lightly. It had not entered his head that most of the small liberties the world has gained have been won on battlefields and over barricades.

As soon as I reached Constantinople I sent a note to Hussein. The next day the bell-boy brought me his card. Going downstairs, I found Hussein in the reading-room, gloomily looking at the latest "Illustrated London News" and the pictures of the Turkish flight from Kirk Kilisse. When the greetings were over, he turned again to the picture and beat it with his fist.

"What does Christendom think of all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this?" he demanded. "This tragedy is on the conscience of Europe. If they had been half as anxious to help us make reforms as they were to get railway concessions, this defeat would not have happened."

There is a too large measure of truth in Hussein Ali Bey's accusation. It is another paradox of the present situation that while one cannot help rejoicing at the victory of the Christian armies, it is impossible not to blush with shame at the record of Christian diplomacy. "*La politique des chemins de fer*" is the European equivalent of our phrase "dollar diplomacy."

The overthrow of the Turkish power cannot help being a great step in progress. That power has, through the jealousy of Christian statesmen, lasted too long. Europe has never seen another such despotism. Caligula and Nero, Torquemada and the Duke of Alva, Ivan the Terrible and Nicholas II, look like naughty children beside Selim the Grim and Abd-ul-Hamid. No oppression of one people by another, not even Pizarro's remorseless conquest of Peru, can be compared to the domination of the Turks over their Christian subjects.

Just as the banner of the Prophet was receiving its first reverses in Spain, a new standard-bearer arose in the East. Othman, the founder of the Othmanli or Ottoman dynasty, was the chief of a small section of the Seljuk Turks, the barbarian horde which overthrew the empire of the Bagdad Caliphs. From his loins sprang an amazing race of conquerors. Suleiman the Magnificent pushed his frontiers to the walls of Vienna and the Danube, to the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf, and to the heart of the Atlas Mountains in Africa. Othman, the founder, was born in 1258; Suleiman died in 1566. In three hundred years the tribe of nomads had won the largest and by far the richest empire of the times.

The small tribe of Turks could not of course assimilate the people of the vast territory they had conquered.

The Baron de Tott who was adviser to Mustapha III about 1770 has left this definition of the Turkish régime:

"The Turkish Government may be considered in all its history as an encamped army whose chief, from his headquarters, orders foraging expeditions into the surrounding country."

True at the time it was written, this definition is true to-day. There has been no Turkish Nation in the Western sense of the word—no patriotism. A Turk "would no more think of giving his life for his country than he would of dying for his meridian of latitude." The Ottoman Empire always has consisted and still consists of victors and victims. The conquerors have never thought of the land as theirs in the sense that it was to be developed and treasured. Greece, Macedonia, Armenia, Syria, Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis, have been so many territories which they held by the sword and from which it was natural to squeeze as rich a tribute as possible. They have been not only victors, but despoilers.

After the first three centuries of victory there came three of decay. Since the interview of Napoleon and the Czar at Tilsit it has been a century of humiliation. Turkey has continued to exist by tolerance.

But even in the period of "glory" there is little about the Turks to admire except their feats of arms. They gave no new ideas, no new concepts of beauty, to the world. Their mosques are copies of Saint Sophia. Even the copies—some of which are of great beauty—were built by architects of another race. Their literature, which is extensive, is utterly dominated, in thought and form, by that of Persia. The late E. J. W. Gibb, the accepted authority on Turkish literature, explains the surprising fact that so warlike a people have left almost no martial poetry by saying that it was probably because they could find no models for such verse in Persian.

Suleiman the Magnificent wore imported cloth which no Turks ever learned to weave. His jewels came from abroad. Persia made the tiles for his mosque. His favorite shawl, which now hangs over his tomb, was made in Cashmere. The Turks have given us no philosophers. Unlike the Arab civilizations of Bagdad and Granada, everything brilliant about the Turks was borrowed—except their swords.

The vices of the Sultans are notorious. Even in times of peace Constantinople is a gruesome place to visit. "It was here," says the guide, "that Sultan Mahmud II stood to watch the massacre of the Janizaries." "This mosque was built by Sultan So-and-so in memory of his brothers whom he murdered to reach the throne." Their extravagance was even more startling than their cruelty. Under Abd-ul-Aziz the royal household spent in one year $30,000 for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sugar alone. The depravity of the imperial harem is not to be written about.

But the Sultan was the ideal of the Turks. "*Padishah-em tshok yasha!*" (Long life to our Sultan!) He was the shadow of God on earth. No Ottoman seriously criticised him for his cruelty, extravagance, or depravity. His subjects tried to emulate his example. The provincial governors, the village judges, the sub-officers of the army, each to the measure of his ability was a little sultan. The descendants of the Othmanli clan—a small minority scattered over a large empire—"lived off the country." The unconsidered subjugated *rayas* (Christians) paid the price.

But the burden of despotism fell also on the non-Turkish Mussulmans. Even among the True Believers there was the distinction of Conquerors and Conquered. The falsifying of justice, the wholesale dishonesty of officials—which always accompanies tyranny—were felt also by the Albanian peasant and the Egyptian *fellah*.

Military service, from which the *rayas* were exempt—for the Turks did not want to put arms in the hands of their serfs—was the form in which the Mohammedan subject found the worst abuses of tyranny. Every Mussulman was supposed to serve seven years. But, as there is no record of births and deaths, it would be impossible for even an honest government to enforce universal service. No one serves who can pay, and those who cannot are often forced to enlist for a second or third time. This quotation from Victor Bérard's "La Révolution Turque" gives a picture of military life in recent times:

"Quartered in an isolated garrison of Europe, Arabia, or Africa, he [the private] is left without pay, without clothes, without shoes, without bread; the Minister, the prefects, and the officers steal the appropriations, rob the commissary stores and even the arsenals. Half-naked, hungry, smitten with fevers and syphilis, the unfortunate soldier is forced to brigandage or revolt. In a Mohammedan district he goes hungry a long time before robbing the inhabitants. In a Christian district each garrison is a pest for miles about."

Of course there has been some leaven of righteousness in this mess of turpitude. Some of the most dissolute Sultans have made serious, if unsuccessful, efforts to reform this or that branch of the administration. A few viziers have been honest men. The one character that stands out as the shining light of decency and liberalism in Turkey is that of Midhat Pasha. All through his life an upright administrator, a steadfast advocate of progressive reforms, the author of the Constitution, and, in the end, a martyr to the cause of humanity, his was a life which would have enriched the heritage of any people. He had very little education, and made only one short trip to western Europe; most of his ideas were the direct outgrowth of his practical experience as an administrator. In 1861 he was appointed Governor of the Danube provinces—the present Bulgaria. His first act was to create an advisory council, in which all religions and nationalities were represented. He soon won the confidence of the population, and peace and order were established for the first time in centuries. Roads were built, navigation on the river facilitated, and material progress was made in education. But the pacification in these provinces did not suit the interests of some who had the ear of the Sultan, and Midhat Pasha was transferred to Bagdad in 1869, and later to the command of the Sixth Army Corps in Arabia. Everywhere he won the confidence of those he governed. But his reforms made him enemies in court, and he was forced to resign. Returned to Constantinople, he became the center of the few Turkish Liberals. For a short time Midhat Pasha was made Grand Vizier under Abd-ul-Aziz, but was soon thrown out.

It was a stormy time in the Empire. After Midhat had left the Danube, insurrections had broken out among the Slavs. Russia was pressing forward. In 1876 Midhat Pasha and his friends were able to force the abdication of Abd-ul-Aziz. Murad V, who succeeded him, proved to have been crazed by debauch, and in a few months those who had overthrown Abd-ul-Aziz deposed Murad, and the throne was offered to Abd-ul-Hamid, then a young man, who loudly professed liberal sympathies.

Intervention by the Powers to stop the disorders in Macedonia was imminent. A diplomatic congress gathered in Constantinople to decide what was to be done. On the day the conference opened (December 23, 1876) the booming of cannons interrupted the deliberations. It was announced that the Sultan had granted his subjects a Constitution. He was going to create from within those reforms which the Powers proposed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

force from without. And so the danger of concerted intervention was avoided.

There is no doubt that Midhat Pasha, who had written it, took the Constitution, which embodied all the Rights of Man, with entire seriousness. But Abd-ul-Hamid regarded it as a shift to get rid of foreign interference. Hardly six weeks after it was granted Midhat Pasha was disgraced and exiled. He was tossed about from pillar to post, and at last imprisoned in a fortress of Arabia. On the 26th of April, 1883, some soldiers broke into his cell and killed him. Not long afterwards Osman Noury Pasha, the Vali of Hedjaz, sent to Constantinople a box which was labeled "*Ivoires japonais. Objets d'art. Pour S. M. le Sultan.*" It contained the head of Midhat Pasha.

The fall from power of Midhat Pasha was due to the intrigues of Count Ignatief, the Russian Ambassador. Throughout his political life he had been an ardent apostle of Pan-Slavism. Already in the sixties he had crossed swords with Midhat Pasha. The pacification of the Balkan Slavs would take away the excuse for Russian intervention and expansion. He secured Midhat's transfer to Bagdad. And in 1876, on the eve of the Russo-Turkish War, a stable, constitutional government at Constantinople was the last thing Russia wanted. Most of the ambassadors were in favor of giving the new Constitution a fair chance, but Ignatief encouraged Abd-ul-Hamid in his absolutist tendencies. Midhat Pasha was sacrificed, the Constitution was forgotten. So the first Turkish effort at reform fell before diplomatic intrigue.

Following the Russo-Turkish War and the Congress of Berlin—where the Turkish delegates were not given an edifying exhibition of Christian concord or unselfishness—the era of "railway diplomacy" commenced. All the Foreign Offices of Christendom went into "business." The jealousy with which they squabbled over railway contracts and concessions allowed the wily Abd-ul-Hamid to play off one against another and, in spite of his evident sickness, keep alive.

The Bagdad Railroad! More diplomatic red tape has been wound and unwound about that question than any other, until of late the Morocco affair has rather overshadowed it.

The problem itself was rather simple. Even the stupidest of the Sultans has realized that his "encamped army" of Turks had need of rapid means of transportation. There were not enough of them to guard all their frontiers, to put down all of the continual revolts; it was necessary to be able to move the army rapidly from one end of the Empire to the other. Abd-ul-Hamid, if he could have had his way, would have covered Turkey with railways. But the treasury was always empty and he had need of foreign capital. Enter the diplomats.

Germany wanted a railway to Bagdad, to open up the rich markets of the Euphrates Valley. It was part of the famous *Drang nach Osten*. This in itself would have been enough to make England oppose it, and besides she did not want to see any European Power established so near to India. France discovered some "interests" in Syria. Russia has always hoped to absorb the Turkish part of Armenia, and the first route traced for the railway would have facilitated the mobilization of the Turkish army in the coveted territory. So, in April, 1900, the Russian Ambassador, Zinovief, called on the Porte with an ultimatum which rendered this route impossible.

The matter was getting beyond the strength of mere diplomats. It was too good a business deal to lose, so the Kaiser himself took a hand. The Protestant Wilhelm, after a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulcher, called on the Red Sultan at Constantinople. The Empress, who will not receive divorced persons in her Court, went out to dinner on the arm of Abd-ul-Hamid. The Kaiser presented the Sultan with a fountain in a style which represents the transition from Byzantine to *art nouveau*. It now stands in the noble old hippodrome of Constantine the Great. And the concession for the Bagdad Railroad was let to a German syndicate.

In the same way Austria and Russia quarreled over every project of a railway in the Balkans. As a result of this quarter of a century of bickering, Turkey has very few and very bad railways.

I recall a ride on one of them. After winding about among some low hills, we came out onto a smooth, unbroken plain, but still the tracks twisted and turned amazingly. An old resident explained the matter to me. The contractors had undertaken to build the road under an annual guarantee of about three thousand dollars per mile. Of course the more the track deviated from a straight line, the longer it would be, and the larger would be the annual guarantee.

At times this commercial diplomacy has been somewhat interrupted by the outcry caused by the massacre of Christians in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Armenia, Macedonia, or Crete. Germany has stuck to business right along, but the other nations have from time to time reached "accords," and have delivered "joint notes" to the effect that these horrors must stop. But the diplomats have been contented with promises of reform, business has been resumed, and the massacres have continued.

Things might have gone on in this way indefinitely if the rearrangement of international politics had not brought into *entente* the two nations most inclined to intervening in Turkey. England, whose free-thinking humanitarians are always active on behalf of oppressed Christians, and Russia, most of whose governing class are imbued with Pan-Slavic ideas, made friends. On the 9th of June, 1908, King and Czar met at Revel, and the two Governments agreed on a programme of reforms for Macedonia which they were prepared to enforce, if necessary, with arms. Abd-ul-Hamid's diplomacy had failed him. It looked as if serious European intervention was inevitable.

In July the Young Turk revolution took place. The forgotten Constitution of Midhat Pasha was revived. Once more it staved off effective intervention.

Gradually the dust is beginning to settle on the scene of that surprising revolution. But many points are still obscure.

Certainly the idealistic element of Young Turks, who, like Hussein Ali Bey, were writing odes to Liberty in Paris, did not have the force to bring that revolution about.

But I met another type of Young Turk, who, it seemed to me, bore only lip service to the high idealism of my friend. These were men who had held and had lost "jobs" under Abd-ul-Hamid. I could see nothing "young" about them; trained in the "old school," they used the phrases of liberalism haltingly. They bore all the hall-marks of corrupt officials—the "outs" who wanted to get "in." But even they did not seem to represent any force.

It was with difficulty that these two discordant elements could raise enough money to keep alive and circulate their few revolutionary papers. As far as they had any practical hope of success, it lay in the army. Many of the officers were disaffected. The rank and file would follow any leader who would pay their arrears of wages. But they had no definite plan for raising money. Hussein Ali Bey hoped that the progressives of the West would contribute. Others put their trust in the governments who looked with disquiet at Germany's preponderance at the Porte.

I had seen Armenian committees trying for decades to interest Christian Powers in behalf of their people. I myself had tried to raise money among Western Liberals for the friends of Russian freedom. I started back to America in the first week of July, feeling that there was very little hope for a change in Turkey. The first newspaper I saw in New York announced that the Sultan had given in to the Young Turks almost without a struggle. I am sure that the Young Turks in Paris were as much surprised at the news as I was.

There was another element at work in the crisis which no one who was not actually in Turkey could see. The national spirit which had been leavening the Balkan Peninsula had reached the educated class of Turkey—and that means the army officers. The great majority of Turks who know any language beside their own hold some military title. Nationalism took the form of anger against Abd-ul-Hamid because of his humiliating foreign policy and his administration of the army, which was equally humiliating from a nationalist point of view. Gradually the country was being handed over to the foreigner.

The Revel agreement threatened a new and greater intervention. The terms of the agreement were not known, but there was talk of European governors and European officers.

In the Turkish newspaper "Ikdam" of August 22, 1912, Riza Tewfik Bey, one of the most influential of the Committee of Union and Progress in the early days, wrote:

"When—in order to escape at any cost from the decisions reached at Revel—we were obliged to try a bluff, a legitimate one, there were hardly more than a dozen of us at Constantinople to force the acceptance of our orders. This is something which many people do not know. There were at that time perhaps not more than three thousand Unionists in the world."

The Committee of Union and Progress—a secret organization of Young Turks, with their headquarters at Salonika—made their "bluff," and were themselves surprised at the unanimity with which the officers of the army joined them.

The Committee, which became the real

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government of Turkey, was made up of the three elements I have described: Idealist dreamers, like Hussein Ali Bey, who spoke and thought like Rousseau; men who had a grudge against Abd-ul-Hamid, but whose ideas of the purpose of government were the same as his; and army officers who for the most part had been educated in Germany under the influence of authoritative and militaristic ideals and who were rabid nationalists.

The new Government took its phrases from the first group, promising equality of all citizens before the law, liberty of thought and word and worship, inviolability of the domicile, and so forth. Too often it took its methods from the second group. The number of sincere progressives was too small to fill all the important posts, so a large part of the administration stayed in the hands of Old Turks, and the hoary methods of corruption persisted. More and more the Government took its ideals from the army officers.

What would have happened if the new régime had been given peace no one can tell. Hussein Ali Bey is desperately certain that with a fair chance the Liberal element would have prevailed. But the foreign aggression with which Young Turkey was at once faced favored the military and nationalistic spirit.

They were not, like the first French Republic, faced by a holy alliance of kings determined to protect the theory of their divine right. There was an unholy acquiescence on the part of Europe in Austria's swallowing of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Bulgaria's absorption of eastern Rumelia. France's aggression in Morocco, the policy of England and Russia in Persia, while not directly attacking Turkey, strengthened the feeling that the lands of Islam were in danger. Italy's raid in the Tripolitaine solidified the general feeling. It is small wonder that the military element dominated very quickly and that the Constitution of Midhat Pasha once more became a dead letter.

On August 6, 1910, Taloot Bey addressed a convention of the Party of Union and Progress at Salonika as follows:

"According to our Constitution, all Turkish subjects, Mussulmans and Christians alike, are equal before the law. But you ought to understand for yourselves that this is impossible. First of all, The Cheriat [Holy Law] is opposed to it; all our history, the sentiment of hundreds of thousands of True Believers, is opposed to it."

The report from which I quote says that all the assembly applauded Taloot Bey. They had traveled a long way from the dreams of equality of Midhat Pasha and Hussein Ali Bey. This denial of the Constitution, the reaffirmation of the traditional policy of a race of victors and a score of nations of victims, had its inevitable results. The massacres of Armenians in Asia Minor, of Bulgars, Serbs, Greeks, and Albanians in Macedonia, were as bad as any Abd-ul-Hamid ever perpetrated.

It is very doubtful whether the sincerely liberal Young Turks could have controlled the Government and have reformed Turkey even if they had not been attacked. The evils against which they would have had to fight were age-old habits. But certain it is that Austria's raid on Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Europe's acceptance of this aggression, killed the hopes of real reform. The preachers of peace were helpless in the face of Christian Powers who acted on the principle that might makes right.

The attitude of the educated Turk is shown in a long editorial in to-day's "Ikdam." The important paragraph is:

"The fundamental motive of international politics is self-interest. There is not a state nor a statesman who would not sacrifice the best friends from the moment that their own interests were at stake."

The advocates of brotherly love had small chance in the face of such convictions as this. The worst element soon controlled the new Government.

But, although every observer here knew that the Committee of Union and Progress was riding the country to ruin, and that the new Government, which supplanted it a few weeks before the outbreak of the war, was little better, few expected that the ruin would be so quick and overwhelming.

One European who has lived here many years said:

"I cannot understand how we were so blind. Of course we knew things were rotten here. But it's become a sort of superstition that the Turk can at least fight."

But I find no evidence that the Turkish soldiers are less brave to-day than in the past. With wonderful recuperative power, after a disastrous defeat at Kirk Kilisse, and with no food in the meantime, they fought stubbornly at Lule Burgas for two days more. "An army marches on its stomach." And the Turkish soldier has been defeated, just

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the Russians were—because inefficiency has come to blows with efficiency.

Here are two stories which I cite out of hundreds that are going the rounds, because I can vouch for their truth.

A trainload of bread left here for the front. No one had been detailed to receive it. The engineer, before leaving, had been peremptorily ordered to bring his locomotive and cars back within forty-eight hours. He waited in a siding thirty-six hours for some one to receive the bread, and then hauled the entire load back to the city.

Four thousand cases of macaroni were left out in the rain without cover until the contents melted.

Meanwhile men at the front were dying of hunger.

It is impossible to forecast the future. We know nothing here which has not passed the censor. The daily papers come out with great white spaces where the authorities blue-penciled the proof and the editor did not have time to fill up. It is impossible to know what is happening even close at hand.

Certainly a great wave of confidence has come over the Turks. They believe that Germany and Austria will come to their aid and precipitate a European war if necessary. It is also certain that they are being led to think so by Germans whom they think speak with authority. If the German Government does not intervene on behalf of Turkey, it will have to repudiate a number of its agents here, as it did after the Morocco crisis.

There are about one hundred thousand new troops on the lines at Tchataldja. They are said to be the pick of the army. Within a few days thirty thousand more are expected from Asia Minor. Sanitary conditions are said to be much better than they were earlier in the campaign, and the front is now only twenty-five miles from Constantinople, and both ends of the line can be provisioned by sea. So the commissary work is very much simplified.

Certainly the allies would have much harder work forcing these lines than they have encountered so far. The Bulgarian army has already lost very heavily.

But months would have to pass before the Turks could organize their transport service for an effective advance. If they are able to make peace at London and keep a foothold in Europe—the command of the Straits—they will be lucky.

But the Turkish army officers whom I have seen here do not think so at all. They talk as if they had just had a successful campaign. They say they will never surrender Adrianople, and talk lightly of advancing to its relief. This feeling is so strong that the Ministry of Kiamil Pasha will probably be overthrown if peace is signed on the terms I have suggested.

The reason for this optimism is not hard to find. It is twofold: encouragement by—probably irresponsible—Germans; and the censorship. The papers do not publish the fact that the sailors are still, in mid-December, wearing linen summer uniforms, and that the shortage of coal caused by the Greek blockade not only paralyzes the fleet but seriously interferes with bringing up reinforcements by rail from Asia Minor; nor that in this month of torrential rains not one man in twenty on the lines of Tchataldja has a waterproof. The papers are not allowed to comment on the financial situation. But the treasury was empty when war broke out. The Turks cannot now afford to buy bandages or antiseptics for the wounded. They cannot support an army of 130,000 men indefinitely. Such facts as these the censor stops. But every rumor of trouble between Austria and Servia is passed. To-day the papers say that Austria has sent an ultimatum to Belgrade telling the Serbs to evacuate Durazzo within twenty-four hours. If it is true, it is immensely serious news. But it is probably false.

There are so many rumors afloat! One of the wounded soldiers in Bayazid's Mosque told me that he had heard that the Prophet Mohammed had appeared in a vision to King Ferdinand and had converted him to Islam, and that this was the reason why the cannonade which was audible a few days ago had ceased. He asked me if it was true.

Nothing short of the best surgical skill could keep the poor chap alive, and he seemed to take comfort in the tale, so I told him that the rumor was not yet confirmed.

I guess it was as true as most of the "unconfirmed rumors" we have here.

Constantinople

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DRIVEN FROM THE CITY: ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW[1]

BY RAYMOND B. FOSDICK

FORMER COMMISSIONER OF ACCOUNTS OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

MR. RICHARD SPILLANE'S article, "Driven from the City," published in The Outlook a few weeks ago, came, perhaps, as a vivid revelation to those citizens whose business does not bring them actively into contact with the machinery of municipal administrations. The average man has a vague idea that city departments represent the last word in inefficiency; he pictures the municipal employee as a shifty individual with a receptive palm. Mr. Spillane's article, therefore, confirmed his worst suspicions. Here was a man who had been actively up against the system and who marshaled his facts in a damning array. An exorbitant assessment had been levied upon his property by fee-hungry commissioners; his factory was damaged by the outrageous private use of a public street; he was unable to secure from the city an adequate supply of water for his manufacturing purposes; the installation of an electric equipment in his plant was delayed because a stenographer in the city's employ was on her vacation; violations were placed upon his factory by the Building Department, and he was held up by an inspector who told him to use "some sense" and offered to "fix it" for $20 or $30. Later the inspector raised the price to $50. In spite of a complaint, the employee is still in the service of the city. It is no wonder that this manufacturer threatens to move out. The really astonishing part is that he has stayed so long.

The purpose of the present article is not in any way to minimize the seriousness of the situation which Mr. Spillane so vividly portrays. Nor have I any reason to believe that he has overstated his case. From my experience as head of a city department in New York I am convinced that hundreds of citizens could, if they cared to, tell stories of similar treatment at the hands of municipal agencies. I could myself fill many pages with incidents of this kind which came to me for investigation from one source or another during my term as Commissioner of Accounts in New York City. To attempt to belittle such incidents or to defend the guilty employees would be foolhardy. There is no defense and no excuse that can be successfully offered. Mr. Spillane's indignation is fully justified by the facts.

The situation, however, cannot be left where Mr. Spillane left it in his article—with the manufacturers moving away in disgust. There will be thousands of manufacturers who cannot move away. Moreover, it is a question broader than any one branch of industry; it affects the basic principle of successful democracy. It *must* be solved. We cannot afford to throw up our hands and move out.

For this reason, therefore, it is important that the problem should be clearly understood. It should be surveyed from all angles. Mr. Spillane's point of view is that of a business man who has collided with a grossly inefficient governmental machine. His charges are directed against municipal employees and agencies: a corrupt condemnation commission, a lax assistant corporation counsel, a demoralized water department, and a dishonest building inspector.

The question before us now is simply this: Are there other points of view from which the problem can be surveyed? Are there any other factors, aside from those which Mr. Spillane points out, which must enter into an adequate consideration of the question? Is the demoralization of city government to be charged solely to the corruption and incompetency of those whom we employ to perform our public work? Is it not possible that laxity and even dishonesty in the conduct of a city's affairs are often encouraged and fostered by business interests and private citizens to further their own ends? Is it not a fact that the moral level of a government cannot rise above the moral level of the citizens behind it? Can we not truthfully say that the general standard of a

[1] See editorial comment elsewhere in this issue.—THE EDITORS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

city government reflects, in the long run, the standards of the community that supports it?

Looking at the question from this angle, we must agree that it is not possible to maintain an equitable and efficient administration of public business in a community in which any large number of citizens are seeking to obtain special favors and exceptions, or are secretly encouraging lax conditions in city departments to further their own purposes. Under such insidious attacks any administration will crumble.

The fact is that there is no such thing as automatic political machinery, guaranteed to insure virtue and efficiency. Even if there were such an improved device, it could not be superimposed upon an indifferent people. There is no particular moral superiority in a piece of governmental mechanism. Whatever value along these lines it possesses it takes from the influences that surround it.

Let us use as an illustration the city government of New York, with its forty-five departments and bureaus and its 60,000 municipal employees. A big, complex mechanism and a vast army of men! Under the most favorable conditions it would be exceedingly difficult to bring order and efficiency out of so gigantic a machine. But suppose, in addition to the obstacles which one could reasonably anticipate in the way of awkward laws and stupid restrictions, an administration found itself insidiously and secretly undermined by hundreds of citizens from whom it had a right to expect support; suppose that the 60,000 employees were subject to the daily importunities of business men who wanted to get something to which they were not entitled under the law; suppose that these business men were often "leading citizens" who came like wolves in sheep's clothing with innocent stories to conceal vicious plans—how long could that administration keep itself pure and unspotted from the world?

But let us consider a few concrete facts. In 1911, shortly after the Asch fire on Washington Place, New York, the office with which the writer was connected made an investigation of certain rumors afloat in regard to the corruption of inspectors in the Building Department. In the course of this investigation we subpœnaed as witnesses many of the prominent builders and contractors of the city.

The testimony which some of these estimable gentlemen reluctantly gave under cross-examination was astonishing. Most of them of course denied recollection of any *particular* payments to inspectors. They admitted, however, the general practice of feeing inspectors in return for special favors. Said the president of a large construction company:

> I give them [the inspectors] an odd five dollars just the same as giving a tip to a bank clerk or anybody else. It is simply an ordinary thing to give a fellow five dollars or something like that. It is a common thing, anyway.

The president of another construction company admitted freely that payments to inspectors were often made:

> Q. By your concern?
> A. Not by our concern particularly. I guess by everybody, more or less. . . . Our men would say they wanted to put up this thing or that thing temporarily and so and so, the inspector would put up a holler, and then he would stay away for half a day, perhaps, and when he came back everything would be all right, and our men would let it go in as expenses on the time sheets.

In one case the contractor for the construction of a garage on West Eighty-third Street paid the iron inspector of the Building Department $10 to pass a certain grade of iron. The contractor, however, evidently thought that the money should come from the pocket of the sub-contractor who was in charge of the iron work. At any rate, upon his own letter-head, he sent him the following bill which was received in evidence in our investigation:

New York, July 21, '10.

——— *Iron Co.*

To Iron Inspector on Garage,
— West 83d St., $10.00

Kindly send check so this don't show up on our books, and oblige ———.

The president of another contracting concern testified that in erecting a building on West Thirty-sixth Street he paid an inspector $35.

"Why did you pay him that sum?" he was asked.

"To instruct me how to get a violation removed," he answered, frankly.

Perhaps the most startling testimony came from the lips of one of the old-time New York contractors, a man who by sheer force of native ability has fought his way to the head of a large building concern. He was testifying as to the repairs which he had made on a loft building located on West

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One Hundred and Thirtieth Street. This is what he said:

A. . . . Here a little inspector comes up—I call him little because he has not been in the building business as long as I have. He comes up there and says, "Well, you have to put in forty pieces of stuff." I think fifteen will be enough.

Q. So you paid him?

A. I wouldn't deny that, but that is so common.

Q. So common that you didn't think anything about it?

A. No. Why should I? I am not a squealer. It took a long time for me to learn it. That is the fact. What are you going to do? They can make you more bother.

Q. I take it, then, that this particular case is not the only case in your experience where you have found it necessary to give money to building inspectors?

A. No. I have to do it, and so does everybody who succeeds in New York.

Success in New York! Have we not here the true secret of the situation? The hurrying, greedy rush for success before which even our civic ideals go down!

I venture the assertion that if the contractors and builders of our communities actually wanted to eliminate graft in our building departments, they could do it in ten days. The trouble is that many of them do not want to eliminate it. They need it in their business. They want the privilege of putting in a three-inch beam where a six-inch beam is required, or fifteen pieces of timber where forty are called for. They want to avoid some of the strict sections of the building code. It is cheaper to pay an inspector than to comply with the intricate and perhaps vexatious requirements of our building regulations. If $10 or $25 quietly slipped to an inspector will hasten matters, what's the harm! It's not a bribe, anyway; it's a *tip!* And so the money is passed, and the young inspector begins to realize that the "tips" supplement his meager salary in substantial form.

By and by he comes to expect it, and learns how, by rigorous application of minor features of the law, to make the life of the non-tipping contractor miserable. Perhaps he succeeds in getting himself on the regular pay-roll of a contracting firm—and two instances of this kind were discovered by our investigation in 1911. As the tips become more numerous, the inspector grows more hungry, until finally, perhaps, he is the dean of the grafting fraternity, a "wolf" in his profession! And the builders and contractors quietly shake their heads over him and sigh at the lack of honest men in office.

I hold no brief in the defense of an inspector of this kind, and I am glad that my office was able to root out a large number of them during our investigation in 1911. My indignation, however, runs not against the inspector who takes a bribe, weak and contemptible as he may be, but against the respectable contractor who, with his eyes fastened on *success*, made the graft possible in the beginning.

Illustrations of the kind which we have just considered could be multiplied many times. Take, for example, the excessive prices which many merchants charge the city for the endlessly varying supplies which it must purchase. It is strange into what an attitude of mind the average man falls when he learns that there is a prospect of selling to the municipality something which he owns. It matters not what the thing may be—a park site, groceries, ferryboats, or lampshades—the value of his possession trebles and quadruples in his mind as soon as he sells the city.

"The city's rich; why not?" I have heard him argue. "It comes out of the public treasury anyway, and nobody will suffer. Somebody else will get it if I don't."

So your merchant charges, as we have found him charging in many instances in New York, from two to five times the price he would charge a private buyer. To be sure, he runs the risk of having his bill reduced, but under most administrations it's a good risk. The idea that it is *his* government and *his* officials that he is cheating seems never to enter his head. Whatever social sense he has is blunted. His own personal interest looms so large that he can see no other.

There can be no doubt of the fact that the proverbial extravagance of a municipality in its purchases, and its consequent poverty in matters of necessity, are due as much to the greed and dishonesty of the private citizen as they are to the corruption and incompetence of the city official. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the Bureau of Street Openings, which Mr. Spillane mentioned by inference in his paper. This is where the condemnation commissioners sit to consider the assessments to be laid on property benefited by improvements, and the value of land to be taken by the city. Mr. Spillane was interested only in the first of these functions;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most citizens who have relations with a condemnation commission are interested chiefly in the second; that is, they are anxious, and legitimately so, to obtain, within reasonable limits, as much from the city for their property as possible.

I have just said "within reasonable limits." That is hardly true. My experience as an official with proceedings of this kind leads me to believe that the average citizen will go to almost any length to prove an exorbitant value for his property when it is being taken for public purposes by a municipality.

I have heard experts, retained by these citizens, swear to figures so astounding as even to bring a laugh from the commissioners themselves, accustomed as they are to experiences of this kind. I have heard these citizens sobbingly testify about the "intrinsic value of the old homestead that no money can ever replace," only to learn upon investigation that they purchased their property within two or three years—indeed, in one or two cases, subsequent to the published determination of the city to take the land. I have heard these citizens testify to the "enormous damage" which a proposed improvement would do to their property, shaving off verandas and cutting houses in two, only to find that the verandas were added, and even the houses were built, after the city made up its mind to take the property, and with the deliberate intent that they should be shaved off and cut in two. I have even known some of our good citizens to buy up old houses and move them to the line of a street-widening proceeding, so as to be able to collect extensive damages. I have known some of these citizens to bring political and ecclesiastical pressure to bear on condemnation commissioners in order to influence the awards. I have known of forgery practiced and bribery attempted over and over again; and it is no secret that an eminent citizen of the Bronx, a popular speaker at taxpayers' gatherings, is to-day a fugitive from justice on this very charge.

When Mr. Spillane complains, therefore, of the laxity of an assistant corporation counsel, while admitting that the charge may be true, I am tempted to remark, not by way of justification but more as an interesting side-light, that the young man, whoever he was, was probably pitted against a formidable array. Conspiring to undermine his work as a defender of public rights in this particular proceeding were doubtless a dozen citizens, each with his own skilled attorney, each determined to get as much out of the pie as he could.

My wonder is not that the assistant corporation counsel in question should be lax in his duty; I wonder that, in the face of the forces thus arrayed against him, he should succeed at all.

It is not only a question of dishonesty and graft; often it is official laxity and delay which are fostered by our "business citizens" in their feverish chase after "success." Take, for instance, the matter of automatic sprinkler systems whose installation has been ordered in many classes of buildings in New York, to prevent such disasters, for example, as occurred in the Asch fire on Washington Place. Have the manufacturers and merchants of New York taken kindly to the idea? Have they attempted to co-operate with the officials of the Fire Department in the prompt installation of a device which has met with widespread approval among fire-prevention authorities? Have they made the path of the fire officials easy? Save in a few scattering instances, we must answer emphatically, *No*. Automatic sprinkler systems cost money, and the lesson of Washington Place is easily forgotten. Every conceivable device has been resorted to, to impede the officials of the Fire Department. Court injunctions, technical legal delays, protests from "influential" citizens, appeals for revision of orders, and even bribes have met the efforts of this city department to enforce a humanitarian regulation.

When, in 1911, my office made an examination of the Bureau of Fire Appliances which had this matter under its jurisdiction, we found that out of one hundred and six orders for the installation of sprinkler systems, issued in 1910–11, only eight had been complied with. In the language of the Bureau Chief, the rest had been "sidestepped." Moreover, we found that the spirit of the Bureau had been broken. The fight had all gone out of it. Weakness and demoralization had taken the place of order and efficiency.

"What's the use?" said one of their members to me during the examination. "We're up against a brick wall, and we might as well quit!"

I have no use for the public official who quits. The man who enlists in the public service, if he does his duty, must reconcile himself to a fighting career. The blows he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gives and takes for the public good are part of the game; and if he is a true soldier, he will do his work unflinchingly, no matter how formidable the opposition. The only bitter phase of the work is that the fight, to so large an extent, must be waged against his own people—the very men from whom he ought to receive support—the manufacturer who wants something, the merchant anxious to avoid a regulation, the citizen with a "special favor" to obtain. These are the insidious foes of the public official. These are the men who often make efficiency in city administration a joke and honesty a mere matter of words.

Men of this kind profess to believe in "good" government. I think they actually do believe in it so long as it affects the gangster, the grafting policeman, the saloon-keeper, and their neighbors' property. But once let it touch their own private interests, the things that govern the size of their bank accounts, how quickly Jekyll changes to Hyde!

I remember that a committee of business men once made an appointment with me to call at my office with a protest against the installation of automatic sprinkler systems in their factories. At that time my office was engaged in an investigation of the failure of the Fire Department to compel compliance with this regulation. The appointment was for Monday morning. On the Saturday afternoon before, occurred that staggering disaster on Washington Place at which one hundred and forty-one working-girls lost their lives. Did the committee of business men experience a change of heart? Did they alter their plans? Did they resolve that in the light of the catastrophe they would make safety their first consideration? No, not at all. They didn't even postpone their appointment. They came in full force. In introducing them to me, their chairman thus addressed me:

"Commissioner, I hope you will not say anything to the newspaper men about our visit here to-day. I am afraid our cause will be temporarily unpopular."

I am glad that there was no stenographer present to take down the language of my reply! One hardly knows which is the more amazing, the callousness of these manufacturers in the face of a calamity which shocked the Nation, or their utter lack of any feeling of public or private responsibility.

What interpretation can be placed upon these facts? What is the answer to the question which they raise? Is it not this: That the problem of effective democracy involves not only improved officials and improved forms of government, but also improved citizens? That the preservation of democracy, as George Santayana said, depends upon the ability of the common man "to become something of a saint and something of a hero"? That the evils of which we now complain cannot be entirely eradicated until the *individual*—the lawyer, the clergyman, the manufacturer, the housekeeper—comes to understand, through years of development in the art of citizenship, the meaning of social responsibility? Mr. Spillane's picture is true as far as it goes, and no one can dispute the seriousness of the situation which he portrays. But he does not go far enough. There is another phase of the matter which must enter into any adequate consideration of the question, and which must be thoroughly understood before solution is possible.

It is true that our city governments have been the playthings of party bosses; that public interests have been intentionally thwarted and choked by manipulation and law; that public opinion has been stifled by awkward machinery; that the inefficient public servant has been the rule rather than the exception.

The fight carried on against this old régime has been long and bitter, and there is still much to be done. To this fight we who have already seen some service welcome Mr. Spillane and his fellow-manufacturers as companions-in-arms. They are in a position to play a worthy and effective part. Only let them not come with any delusions. The battle will not be won by overthrowing a boss, or electing a mayor, or passing a charter, necessary as these incidents may be. It will not be won simply by installing a new piece of governmental machinery, or sweeping out of office inefficient corporation counsels, although such steps may be of great importance.

After all, it is the *citizens* themselves—the manufacturers and merchants and business men—who in the last analysis determine the character of government. They are the responsible parties. It is on them that the success or failure of our experiment in democracy ultimately depends.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPECTATOR

FIFTEEN days aboard a fishing schooner, a plunging, rolling little chip of a boat with one rail constantly under water, were for the Spectator fifteen days of revelation. That first morning, long before the sun was up—indeed, the alarm clock in the fo'c's'le pointed to two—Herb, the cook, a plump, cheerful man, put a whistle to his lips and sent a shrill, disturbing blast into the air. From the bunks beside the little triangular table eight men swung their legs, raised themselves on elbow, and rubbed their eyes, then slid to their places and were eating. They rolled back into their bunks, a second shift replaced them, and, ere that shift had done, the watch poked his rubber-clothed head down the hatch and said, shortly, "All ready!" Then every man in the fo'c's'le heaved a sigh. They were serious men now. They didn't even greet the Spectator. Quietly they poked their feet into heavy leather boots and pulled on their oilskins. And the little boat, as if to emphasize the disagreeableness of duty and the uncertainty of the Spectator's footing, plunged under a wave and flung through hawseholes and over rails a flood of water that pattered on deck like buckshot.

To launch a small boat in rough mid-ocean, except on the lee side of a vessel, the Spectator had concluded long before, is not good nautical form. But the taut-faced skipper on the Evelyn Thompson, the smallest man on board, didn't object to speeding his little schooner by the wind while lowering away from both sides simultaneously. In the chill dusk before dawn a dory on the starboard side was hoisted and dropped splashing into the trough between two waves. A form in oilskins poised itself on the rail, then dropped overboard into that dory, of course. Another form snatched the painter of the plunging fifteen-foot craft, ran aft with it, and snubbed it through a dead-eye. And on the windward side, too, a dory was dropped. Neal, a hearty Irishman, the only one on board, slid over the rail and disappeared, and a man snatched the painter and ran with it astern. He snubbed it tightly about a post near the wheel. The vessel plunged ahead. The slack of the rope was taken up with a shock, and the dory, caught sidewise on the hill-side of a wave, leaped ahead like a dog in leash and dove straight under the dory that had preceded it. The Spectator heard a crash, then a thud, and there Neal lay, half stunned, in the bottom of that first dory. It was fortunate, thought the Spectator, that he was flung precisely there, else he were lost, for, like a majority of the fishermen, he could not swim, and even were he able to swim, heavily clothed and but half-conscious, he would have sunk like a plumbing lead. Truly, considered the Spectator, this is an exciting but not auspicious start.

One by one, in the form of a great crescent two miles long, those sixteen dories were left behind. Far astern at dawn, with tiny sails upraised, they appeared like miniature lighthouses standing out against the sky. But the farthest, the dory tipping the great crescent, even with a glass from the deck could not be discerned. Then the skipper put the wheel to starboard, the Spectator crutched the jib, and the vessel swung slowly about, and anon that far-away end dory was reached, its occupant came aboard, and the boat was taken in tow; and then another and another, and still one more—four, though some skippers take as many as six or eight—and then the rest were hoisted on deck and naught remained on the surface of the sea to mark the whereabouts of the lines anchored six hundred feet below the surface save brightly colored little keg buoys dancing far from one another on the waves. And then two bells for nine o'clock struck, and once more the whistle of the cook, now a whit more welcome, sounded tremulously from the fo'c's'le, and the first shift again took their places at table to a dinner that might have pleased, and with the appetites of fishermen surely would have delighted, an international convention of chefs. And then, again, when the second shift scarcely had finished eating, the watch sang out in the hatchway, and once more all those dories had to be launched and left astern, each near its respective buoy.

Standing in the bows of their dories out there on the white-flecked ocean, the men began hauling those heavy lines, laden with cumbersome fish, six hundred feet from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bottom of the sea. And the dories pitched, and plunged, and took in water, and threatened to go—and they often do go—end over end. Arduous work that is, the Spectator discovered one calm day, hoisting one of those heavy lines—heartrending when naught but skates and dogfish come to be slatted off against the side of a dory, or a shark lingers by and plucks the delectables ere they can be gaffed and heaved aboard. And all the while the dorymate of the Spectator recited tales of life in a dory: how he drifted four days on the open ocean and was rescued near where the Titanic later disappeared; how once his dory pitch-poled end over end off the Banks and he and his dorymate linked arms across its bottom, and he was watching that dorymate when a shark nipped off that dorymate's leg and he begged to be freed from his companion so that he might drown. And then, to revert, those fish were forked in a silver stream over the low rail into pens alongside the skipper's cabin. And part of the crew went into the hold; part stood by table-like troughs and opened and cleaned those four thousand pounds of fish and flung them into two huge tubs, one of which the Spectator, in the reserve regalia of the cook, learned to care for—to fill again and again with water got by "wiggling" a bucket overboard, and to fork the heavy carcasses from the reddened water into the hold to be iced and stowed till T Wharf should be reached again. And then near high noon supper was served. And after supper the remainder of the fish were dressed, and the pens removed, and the deck washed, and from the hold were hauled bushel after bushel of good red herring to be cut in twain and used for bait! The Spectator then recalled his own amateur difficulties in baiting a single hook, and he admired these men standing about the cabin till after darkness had fallen and huge oil torches smudged their features and gave the only light, paddling bare-handed in boxes of slippery herring, and baiting two thousand hooks strung on separate ganges linked to the most obstinate and cumbersome of lines.

The Spectator rested, not sick—no, the Spectator refuses to admit that he was sick—prone on his back one clear, gentle day, and Jim Rice was saying, "It's a poor job baitin', you, even with a south wind blowin', but, says I, it's hard, I'm tellin' you, when the snow's flyin' and your fingers bleedin' with the cold, squidjiggin' them hooks." And suddenly at the wheel the skipper sang out: "Jim, go up in the rigging, there's a swordfish hard to port." And up the rigging fairly strutted Jim, to sing out to the man steering the whereabouts of the monster whose two back fins protruded above the quiet surface of the sea. The skipper picked up a long pole, inserted into its end a dart like a shortened arrow, and carried it forward to the very prow of the little knockabout schooner. There he found a foothold while another man lashed him to the steel stay of the balloon sail. The great silent, unsuspecting monster meandered just ahead of the vessel, just out of reach; its long sword moved to and fro like the bowsprit of a submarine vessel. It dove suddenly, and the skipper swore softly; then back to the surface, a bit to starboard, it rose. The little boat moved nearer and nearer, and the small man at the prow braced himself, then suddenly flung his whole weight into a swift, silent jab. The great fish lunged upward till its sword was high above the water, then swished about, faced the vessel, and plunged downward; the line to the dart grew taut and the dart was twisted sidewise and secured firmly in the animal's flesh, and over the side of the vessel was flung the line, hundreds of fathoms of it, wrapped about a red buoy. The little keg was twisted and yanked astern; a dory was launched, and into it leaped the sturdiest man in the crew, and with him no less a personage than the Spectator himself. The line was being uncoiled rapidly when the buoy was lifted aboard, and then fish and captor settled down for a final struggle. The fish struggled and dove, yet that merciless dart was in its back, that line was constantly kept taut, and, little by little, was being drawn upward; it snatched the tiny boat about, carried it lurching over the sea, twirled it like a toy. Again and again the rodding was run out, then just as surely, bit by bit, won back again. Once, straight to the surface, not a dozen feet from the dory, the struggling animal came with a lunge, and the Spectator will not forget its angry, treacherous eye. And then it plunged again, and fought on and on for fully an hour. Gradually it was brought upward and upward, till it lay alongside, and then the Spectator raised an oar, the schooner ran alongside, and three hundred pounds of flesh, worth twenty cents a pound, amounting to three or four dollars to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every man on board—except the Spectator—was hoisted aboard by what was an hour before the swishing tail of a mighty fish.

Such are the glories of the fisherman's life. And the glories are few, and to these men long since wanting in novelty. Yet danger is always at hand, every hour of day and night. For fifteen days not a man aboard doffed his clothes. The Spectator concluded that the life of a fireman or a miner is as play compared to this life. He believes at last the rigorous tales that he has read of little fishing schooners cut in twain by liners that heaved themselves from the fog, of shipwrecks, of starvation and freezing, and insanity from eating raw fish and taking but a sip of tempting salt water when men are adrift in a dory on the broad surface of the Atlantic. Verily, the Spectator believes, these men are modern industrial heroes. The Spectator feels assured that the vocation of the schooner fishermen is the most hazardous vocation in the world; and he does homage, and he begs the world of consumers to do likewise, to these brave men who speak of death familiarly and frequently, and twit it as a frequent and familiar visitor that snatches a messmate away to a terrible fate, that leaves a flag at half-mast somewhere in the fleet at least once a week.

The reader may wonder, as the Spectator wondered, Why do men engage in such a vocation? And the answer is, primarily, dear reader, because you yourself wish your haddock and your cod on your dinner-table when you return home in these days of precious meat. And, psychologically, because from the beginning of the world men have welcomed the opportunity to gamble co-operatively against fate for stakes and for life itself. Just this do these men do. Danger and desire for freedom—those are the attributes that call men to sea. And those are the attributes, too, that make for individuality. In all his wanderings never has the Spectator discovered sixteen men more individual than these men. From the skipper, thin-lipped, clean-shaven, iron-jawed, a Socialist, to grizzled old Sam, like another Salters in Kipling's "Captains Courageous," and mountainous big Tom, and bantam-weight prize-fighter Jack, every one of them differs in mannerisms, methods, and mind from his neighbor. They are accustomed to meet "thick of fogs," days of snow, days of storm, each in his peculiar manner, simply, but without fear. "I just hauls in me line and keeps an eye on the spot where I see the vessel last," explained Jim. "I thinks on some things," drawled big Tom, "when I's facing death. I ain't got no kids to think on, so sometimes I thinks on God, and then I's got somethin' comin', ain't I?"

But modern industrialism has looked askance on these last of its servants who have retained their particularities. It has looked askance on the romance of the fisherman's life, its loss of time, its very freedom on boat and in port, and it has devised a way to abolish, not the haddock and the cod, but the schooner and the sail. A steam trawl, a sturdy structure of steel that defies wind and weather, poked itself obtrusively into the forest of spars at T Wharf a few years ago. It was followed by another and another, and now there are six of them, and five have never lost a man. The men aboard them, the Spectator discovered at a meal in the mess-room, are the uniform products of continuous work in six-hour shifts, of the steam winch and the stoke-room, operating a powerful vessel that drags for miles great pouches over the bottom of the sea and hauls on deck, willy-nilly, fish by the tons and tons. But the grim schooner fishermen look askance on these steel newcomers; they allege that by them fish and fish-beds are being destroyed, and they have begged the Government to intrude, to drive them from the competitive mart. But even those same schooner fishermen admit that they believe the new boats have come to stay, and that their own vessels little by little are destined to go. The Spectator grieves at their going. He would dislike to see the modern Norsemen robbed of their home on the sea; but life, he feels, is a precious thing, a thing that should be cherished even for these bravest and most willing of men.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A BOOK A WEEK

THIS shall be a story-telling page or so, for once. Here is a volume of "Memories of Victorian London" (Longmans), full of harmless gossip about people of a generation ago—authors, artists, and social notables. The kind of irresponsible narrative of recollections that flits agreeably from anecdote to incident may not be a very high type of biography, but it certainly provides more rational entertainment than inferior fiction. Everybody likes to get glimpses at the unstudied talk of the great or the near-great, if only the stories are well told and fairly representative. In this case the teller is that Mrs. L. B. Walford whose gently humorous novels of English society have had some vogue—particularly her "Mr. Smith," which remains in memory as a pleasing though not brilliant performance. We may begin our anecdote-reading with one which illustrates the character and temperament of two men at once:

PARNELL AND CECIL RHODES

Parnell had partisans who were ready to think everything right that was said or done by this extraordinary man. That he had a magnetic personality none could deny. It affected even such men as Cecil Rhodes, who, after a prolonged interview and discussion of many subjects, wrote to his sister Edith (from whom I had it) that Charles Stewart Parnell was the "most reasonable and sensible man" he had ever met.

The attribute did not, I must own, seem appropriate, but coming from Mr. Rhodes the words were worth recording, also something else that Edith Rhodes related. The two had talked in her presence, and she remembered Parnell saying, "Why, Mr. Rhodes, do you take such an interest in Irish Home Rule? What is Irish Home Rule to you? What is Ireland to you?"

"My interest is an Imperial interest," replied the Empire-Maker. "I believe that Irish Home Rule will lead to Imperial Home Rule."

THE IDLE DARWIN

Coventry Patmore appears more than once in this book, but we like best Mrs. Walford's story of Darwin called out by Mr. Patmore's self-accusation of idleness: "I am dreadfully idle, I am an idler born, but then I believe in a poet's idleness. Idleness is the growing-time of his harvest, and the upcome of a year can be reaped in one fine day." Thereupon this story follows:

Mrs. Darwin told in my hearing a story of her husband which bears on your remark about idleness. She said she was consulting her cook as to any means of tempting her master's appetite, which was a very poor one. "He does not seem to fancy ordinary food," she said. "Try to think of something."

The cook looked up and looked down, and twirled her apron. "If you'll excuse the liberty I'm taking, ma'am, I should say that master would be able to take his food better if he got *something to do*. Idle folks is never hungry."

"But your master is not an idle man," protested Mrs. Darwin, indignant at such a charge. "He is *never* idle. In my opinion, he works *too hard*."

"Excuse me, ma'am," replied the cook, "but if I may make so bold as to say so, I can't agree to that. With my own eyes I see him in the garden yesterday sitting staring at a leaf for over two hours! Two whole hours! Well, *that* ain't work, anyhow."

"Oh, delightful—delightful!" Mr. Patmore lay back in his chair to enjoy the joke to the full. "Darwin staring for two mortal hours at a leaf—that marvelous brain of his working like mad all the while—and a slut who didn't know what a brain was turning up her nose at him for idleness! That two hours' growing-time produced—what did it not produce? A chapter perhaps that the world will not willingly let die."

It was Patmore, by the way, whose little son succinctly but not respectfully observed to him, apropos of his having had three wives, "Father, you are just half a Henry the Eighth."

SHELLEY'S SISTERS

A singular illustration of the fact that a poet is not always full of honor in his own household is seen in this bit of talk between Thackeray's daughter Mrs. Ritchie and "Mary," the unnamed friend from whom the author seems to derive many of her literary reminiscences:

Mrs. Ritchie asked Mary about a visit she had paid shortly before to the Misses Shelley at Brighton. They are the sisters of the poet, but do not appear to set any value on this. Evidently he is not "*My brother*" to them.

"We found we had to tread delicately even if his name seemed within measurable distance of being mentioned," said Mary; "especially with Miss Margaret Shelley, who is prickly and perverse on most subjects, and with her it is not only a case of belittling the prophet in his own country, but of denying that there ever was a prophet at all. Once, in answer to the question, 'Are you a sister of the poet Shelley?' she first stared blankly, then appeared to have a sudden recollection and drew herself up to her full height. 'I once had a brother who, I believe, wrote immoral verses, but I am thankful to say I have never read any of them.'"

SAVAGE LANDOR'S SAVAGENESS

Tales of Walter Savage Landor's critical ferocity abound, but the following account of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a specimen of his conversational running amuck is new, we think:

He struck out with both arms—well, I mean with his tongue—he simply lashed out against every famous man whom the poor archdeacon [Hare]—a very scholarly man, my dears—introduced into their talk.

It began with Michael Angelo. One would think Michael Angelo had been long enough dead, and besides was sufficiently out of Mr. Landor's line, to have escaped animadversion, but no. "Michael Angelo? Pooh! The only well-drawn figure in existence is a small female by Overbeck, in his picture of 'Children brought to Jesus Christ.' As for your Michael Angelo—pooh!"

Then here: "Milton wrote *one* good line, but I forget which it was."

And here: "Dante wrote perhaps *six* good lines. They were in his description of Francesca."

And here: "Carlyle's 'French Revolution' is a wicked book. I have worn out one volume with tossing it on to the floor whenever I came upon an abominable passage."

A LITTLE SLIP

Sir Farrer Herschell, talking about a tedious Academy dinner, told of an odd slip by Lord Houghton, generally the most tactful of men:

He was getting tired and bored, and fell asleep during Matthew Arnold's dissertation. Arnold responded for literature, and Grove for science. Grove had given us quite a scientific lecture—as Houghton whispered in my ear, for I sat next him—and when Matthew Arnold followed in the same vein it was too much for the old gentleman, and he dropped off.

When he woke up, Arnold's speech was still going on, and Houghton felt drowsier than ever and renewed his complaints of this long-winded oratory into the ear of his neighbor on the other side. He said, "Why, this speech is as tedious as the last!"—and who do you think he said it to? Grove himself! Poor Grove, who was so pleased with his own eloquence and smiling around at everybody! He left the table as soon as he decently could, with all the starch taken out of him!

BROWNING AND HOLMES ON ADULATION

Lord Herschell is the authority for the next story:

I was talking to Holmes just now, and Browning came up, and Holmes said to him, "Mr. Browning, do you enjoy all the adulation you receive?" Browning seemed a little taken aback, but replied hesitatingly that it made him feel "profoundly humble"—(not that he ever strikes one as *looking* "profoundly humble"—Lord Herschell laughed a little)—and I must say I thought the American the honester man of the two. He said: "Almost every day I get letters from strangers expressing admiration of my books. I don't know that such admiration is worth much, but I think I should miss the letters if they ceased to come!"

TENNYSON ON VIEW

No English book of reminiscence is complete without its story of Tennyson's dislike of publicity and the horrors he suffered at the hands of impertinent intruders:

The poet, on coming down one morning to breakfast, fancied the room darker than usual, and, on glancing at the windows to discover why, saw that, instead of the blinds being drawn, human blinds excluded the sunlight without. Two faces were pressed against the panes at each window, and remained calmly there, despite detection.

After a momentary pause, he went to the front door and inquired what the visitors wanted.

An elderly American, of the pronounced type, lifted his hat, and replied for the rest: "Sir, one of our reasons for crossing the Atlantic was to see the poet Tennyson, and we resolved to see him if we waited here all day."

"Well, now you have seen me," said he, half-amused, half-annoyed, "will you kindly go away?" Which they did, after a prolonged and exhaustive stare all round.

THE NEW BOOKS

Gift of Abou Hassen (The). By Francis Perry Elliott. Little, Brown & Co., Boston. $1.25.

The leading rôle in this comic extravaganza is taken by a rug which makes whoever stands upon it invisible. The placing of the scene of the tale in plain every-day New York City naturally results in diverting incongruities.

Little Gray Shoe (The). By Percy Brebner. Little, Brown & Co., Boston. $1.50.

This is another tale of a soldier of fortune in an unfortunate and diminutive kingdom. It has the usual number of characterless characters, identified by the usual assortment of labels. The plot moves rapidly and rather easily towards its predestined end.

Ten-Thousand-Dollar Arm (The). By Charles E. Van Loan. Small, Maynard & Co., Boston. $1.25.

Stories of professional baseball, humorous without being comic.

"C Q" In the Wireless House. By Arthur Train. The Century Company, New York. $1.20.

The scene of this readable story is an ocean liner; the chief actors are the younger son of a British ducal family seeking fortune as a wireless operator, a fair lady smuggler, and the wireless. The hero is attractive, the action sufficiently

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brisk, and the surprise at the end quite satisfactory.

Joyful Heatherby. By Payne Erskine. Little, Brown & Co., Boston. $1.35.

There are a great many novels that "need a good shaking" to make them human. Perhaps they should be called "books in the fourth dimension," for, despite the fact that their scenes are often familiar, their characters are certainly not of this world. They may speak our language sometimes, wear our clothes still more often, but think our thoughts they never can. "Joyful Heatherby" is in this class.

Sign at Six (The). By Stewart Edward White. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis. $1.25.

An entertaining mystery story, in which a whole city is successively deprived, for short periods, first of all sound waves, next of all light vibrations, then of every form of electrical manifestation. Fortunately the mysterious unknown who is sending these modern plagues to harass the community is discovered before he has applied his wonderful discovery—except on a small scale—to the suppression of the last form of vibration—heat

Rolling Stones. By O. Henry. Doubleday, Page & Co., New York. $1.25.

This final collection of the late Sydney Porter's work is more interesting than most collections of the odds and ends of an author's work. In the first place, it contains three or four stories which are quite worthy of the author's reputation, and which in some way have escaped inclusion in the previous eleven volumes which, to one's surprise, we find have been published. In the second place, it throws a good deal of light on Mr. Porter's personality, oddities, and traits as a humorist and as a newspaper and magazine worker. Very crude and at the same time very funny in their way are drawings which he made in his early newspaper life; and some of his newspaper work in the way of quips, jokes, and parodies was also worth reprinting.

Pride of War. By Gustaf Janson. Little, Brown & Co., Boston. $1.30.

"Lognerna," Gustaf Janson's collection of stories concerning the Italo-Turkish war, has now been translated from the Swedish and published under the appropriate title "Pride of War." The title is appropriate, for the book is really an earnest, strenuous plea that the brutalities of war be stopped. The author knows well how to portray the physical actualities of modern warfare. The setting for the latest war in Africa is also graphically drawn—the pitiless heat of the sun, the cactus hedges and palms, the waste of sand ridges. With this as a background stands out the tragedy of the fierce struggle between man and man. But the author does not answer the question, Will the end justify the means? It has apparently done so in Algeria and Tunis. A like result may be expected in Morocco and Tripoli.

Atlantis. By Gerhart Hauptmann. Translated by Adele and Thomas Seltzer. B.W. Huebsch, New York. $1.50.

Hitherto we have known Gerhart Hauptmann as a poet and a playwright. We now learn to know him as a romancer. In "Atlantis," the English translation of which has just appeared, Herr Hauptmann has a large stage. He also deals with movements and characters "in the large." The present volume is a romance somewhat of the Faust or Tannhäuser order; the hero's dual nature responds to the conflicting struggles between the spirit and the flesh. Unlike Hauptmann's other books, the scene of action in "Atlantis" is moved from Germany to the ocean, to the tragedy of a sinking vessel and to a New York theater. Americans will read with varied emotions of interest Herr Hauptmann's estimate of the various forces that make up the American spirit. The novel is at once a delineation of character and a moving drama. It is both psychological and symbolical. But its realism is unnecessarily crude, stark, and repugnant. It is certainly not a book for boys and girls.

Making of a Newspaperman (The). By Samuel S. Blythe. Henry Altemus Company, Philadelphia. 50c., net.

This is a rapid and breezy account of the trials of a newspaper man in the making, written with the fluency of a trained and skillful reporter. It is not great biography, but it is certainly easy reading—and the book proves, to invert Sheridan's phrase, that "easy reading" may be "curst hard writing."

Auction of To-Day. By Milton C. Work. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston. $1.25.

Another handbook for the use of those who are enthusiasts in the latest form of bridge. The changes brought about by the "new count" are worked out here carefully; and a non-player may almost be amazed at the amount of deduction, reasoning, and almost philosophizing through which the intricacies of the game are studied.

Strangling of Persia (The). By W. Morgan Shuster. The Century Company, New York. $2.50.

The young American who, as Treasurer-General of Persia, undertook the difficult task of rebuilding the country's shattered financial system led an interesting and exciting career—while it lasted. Not only had he to deal with the intricacies of Oriental politics and finance, but he very soon found himself involved in international complications. Both Russia and Great Britain have large "spheres of influence" in Persia, which serves as a neutral ground between the British frontier in Afghanistan and the Russian frontier in the Caucasus. Mr. Shuster soon found that Russia was by no means friendly to his efforts to establish Persian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

finance on a firm basis; while Great Britain apparently considered it more important to maintain a conciliatory attitude toward Russia than a helpful one toward Persia's Treasurer-General. So Mr. Shuster, just when he was making excellent progress toward solving the serious financial problems before him, was sacrificed to the demands of Russia, and Persia's attempt to rehabilitate itself came to an abrupt and untimely end. Perhaps the young American was a little too outspoken, a trifle too aggressive, for the refinements of European diplomacy. But no one reading his book can doubt his sincerity of purpose and his devotion to the interests of the Persian people. Mr. Shuster writes frankly and fully of his experiences as Persia's financial officer. His book adds an interesting chapter to the history of present-day international relations.

Literary Influences in Colonial Newspapers, 1704–1750. By Elizabeth Christine Cook. Columbia University Press, New York. $1.

This monograph, apparently prepared as part of the University work, is certainly worthy of general publicity. The author has browsed around very thoroughly among the Colonial newspapers, and has picked out a great variety of topics, comment, and discussion. Part of this has historic association, and part of it is simply odd, unique, and from some points of view humorous. Benjamin Franklin was not the only good newspaper writer of his day, as these extracts amply show.

Washington and Lincoln. By Robert W. McLaughlin. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. $1.35.

This volume supplies a lack in the abundant literature called forth by the lives of our Nation's *duumvirs*, our consuls-for-life, as a Roman might regard them—the life of the Republic. In the light of the history which they each bore an eminent part in making, the author traces its constitutional evolution, and exhibits their relation as co-workers in it, the one at its outset, the other at its latest stage. To do this as well as Dr. McLaughlin has done it, through study of the original sources and careful sifting of all the literature pertinent to his theme, is no light task; its accomplishment is meritorious. Its starting-point is well chosen—the "emergence of empire" which dates from the Anglo-French treaty of 1765, and caused a shifting of emphasis from a commercial to a political colonial policy, thereby raising questions of governmental power—its lodgment, source, expression, and abuse. On this background—the Parliamentary era and its group of personages in the mother country—is presented the Revolutionary era with its group in 1776, among whom Washington was dominant, protesting against the Parliamentary theory of governmental power, and justifying the protest by argument. Their successful struggle ushered in the Constitutional era and its representative group in 1787, to formulate the theory of governmental power which had triumphed, and to secure its stability. Its pregnant phrase, "We the people," must be interpreted, says Dr. McLaughlin, "in the light of a conservative reaction from the democracy of the Revolutionary period." He quotes Madison's journal, "The people should have as little to do as may be about government," and holds that "Washington believed in a republican form of government based on the aristocracy of land." But whether "the composite empire" thus formed was a nation, or a mere political partnership, had yet to be defined. This was the question of the National era of 1830 and its historic personages, the greatest of whom is Webster—a period that "cannot be understood," says Dr. McLaughlin, "without counting in the slavery agitator and his little paper." Space fails for more than mention of this and the ensuing Civil War era with its group around Lincoln, maintaining what the National group had defined, and giving "a new and final answer" to the perennial question of power in government and of its abuse. Comparison of the chief heroes shows similarity of work in continuous development under different conditions and relations. The one was distinctively aristocratic, the other democratic, each cherishing "an imperial ideal," each gifted with high qualities for great leadership. Lincoln, however, "with two generations of public life to draw on," a profound thinker on the science of government, and a master in the use of language to express his thought, surpassed Washington in the working of government. Rich in personal interest and documentary lore, this succinct and lucid story of the slow evolution of a constitutional democracy is of more than merely historic value. It bears distinctly and with important evidence on now burning questions that have arisen since Lincoln left that evolution incomplete. A good index makes it a convenient reference-book.

Provence and Languedoc. By Cecil Headlam. George H. Doran Co., New York. $3.50.

Mr. Headlam's book combines a traveler's adventurous spirit with a scholar's knowledge. We are told about the physical features of the valley of the Rhone and the uplands to the west of it. Provence seems adequately treated; Languedoc, inadequately. But, in any event, archæology, history, legend, and literature are all drawn upon freely and advantageously.

Siberia. By M. P. Price. George H. Doran Co., New York. $2.50.

Mr. Price finds Siberia a land economically akin to what Canada was a generation ago and more. As Canada is America's granary in large part, Siberia is the practically untouched granary of Europe. While Mr. Price writes interestingly and suggestively on the commercial and financial features of Siberia, the ordinary reader will, we fancy, be more interested in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

description of the inhabitants and the Russian officials, the Slavs and Tartars, the political exiles, the commercial travelers, the fur trappers, and the Chinese merchants. We may be disappointed that Mr. Price does not show us more of the Siberia of Tolstoy, frigid and cruel, a land of exiled revolutionaries. But we must find gratification in his showing of Siberia as the land of promise for Russia's younger sons.

Pavhosto—The Gospels of Luke and John. Translated from the Original Text by the Rev. Rodolphe Petter, Cantonment, Oklahoma.

This book is a literary curiosity, and also a record of the advance of Christianity. It is a translation of the two Gospels above named into the language of the Cheyennes, made by Mr. Petter, of the Mennonite Mission, who has been among the Cheyennes for over twenty years. The book is not printed in the ordinary way, but is made (and very neatly made too) by a multigraph process. If we may judge of the enormous length of the words as they stare at us from the page, this Indian language must pile up its compounds even more tremendously than does the German. We will quote one single word, not because it is the longest in the book, for it is shorter than other words on the same page, but because it bears such a quaint resemblance to the erratic lines made by a performer on the linotype when he is practicing, which sometimes find themselves in actual print—*nszhesshaomoxtomoxtame.*

Who's Who: 1913. The Macmillan Company, New York. $8.

Year by year the English "Who's Who" (father of all "Who's Who's") increases in size and apparently in its lines of inclusiveness also; at least it is easily evident that this, the sixty-fifth edition, records the names and deeds of a much larger number of living Americans than any of its predecessors. In all we have 2,225 pages of closely printed matter. It would be superfluous to point out the practical value of this reference work.

Romance of Sandro Botticelli. By A. J. Anderson. Dodd, Mead & Co., New York. $3.

Mr. Anderson has followed his "Romance of Fra Filippo Lippi" by a similar book about Botticelli. The word "romance" is used, not in the sense of a love story, but in the sense of a fictitious narrative in prose with imaginary conversations. Mr. Anderson starts with a table of contemporary Florentine events and a chronological list of the Botticelli pictures. Then he takes Botticelli's records from contemporary documents. He takes the records of Botticelli's friends—the Medici, Leonardo, Poliziano, and the rest—from their own writings as well as from contemporary accounts. In like manner he takes the life and art, the philosophy and classicalism, of the age, and then, studying Botticelli's pictures and remembering the patron for whom each was painted, he reconstructs the painter's life. The atmosphere in which Botticelli moved and the persons about him are also reconstructed. If not at every point quite convincing, the result is a deeply interesting historical study in the guise of fiction.

United Italy. By F. M. Underwood. George H. Doran Company, New York. $3.50.

During the past thirty years Italy has undergone both a social and an industrial renaissance. As yet, foreigners hardly appreciate this new temper of Italian life. They still persist in thinking of the Italy of mediævalism. But the real Italy is a new Italy, made by the events of the past half-century. Mr. Underwood's book gives first of all a history of those events, and particularly of the struggles and the difficulties of Church and State. Praise is paid to the founders of modern Italy—Cavour, Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Victor Emmanuel—in especial to Cavour, as the following excerpt shows:

> The flood of patriotism and heroism, however, might have run to waste had there not been the genius of Count Camillo Cavour to guide it into the right channel and restrain it from excess and misdirection. . . . He realized that in order politically to create a nation, public opinion in general, and the statesmen who directed the destinies of Europe, must both be won over to the cause, and must be convinced that it was no anarchic revolutionary explosion, but the heroic inevitable development of the sentiment of nationality in a people whose history and traditions alike entitled them to shape their own destiny and take their place once more among the Great Powers. . . . Through alternations of hope and discouragement, of good and evil fortune, he never faltered or failed in patience, and when, in 1861, at little more than fifty years of age, worn out by unceasing toil and relentless strain, he died, the great work was practically accomplished.

Praise is also paid to those later upbuilders, Crispi, Rudini, Zanardilli, Sonnino, and the present Premier, Giolitti. The sketch of King Victor Emmanuel and his family is sympathetic. So is that of Italian art and literature, though many readers will hardly subscribe to the author's estimate of the poet, novelist, and play-writer, Gabriele d'Annunzio. They will be more likely to subscribe to the critic's conclusion that if, as a poet, Carducci represented the classic tradition in Italy, so the novelist Fogazzaro represented the romantic. Fogazzaro was not satisfied, as Mr. Underwood is careful to add, to tell a story for its own sake. His novels revolve around the problems of the soul, and these problems have to be faced by a more complex generation than that which produced such novelists as Walter Scott and Alessandro Manzoni. The up-to-date religious ties and aspirations of thousands find voice in Fogazzaro's books.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO THE OUTLOOK

AGAINST A STRONG NAVY

In considering Secretary Meyer's demand for three more battle-ships, the following facts are of stupendous importance:

(1) *No nation in the world except Germany spends nearly so large a proportion of its total expenditure for army and navy, exclusive of pensions, as does the United States.* Despite her tremendous excess of danger from outside, Germany's proportion of expenditure is but a fraction of one per cent more than ours; but in her defense of Germans against the enemies of disease and accident within her borders, her efficiency puts ours to the blush.

(2) The United States is the safest country in the world, protected as no other is by two oceans. It began every foreign war it ever had, and lost by foreign bullets but 15,000 men, all told, in them. It has no enemies and will have none if it does justice and ceases to excite suspicion of aggression by its needlessly huge armaments. This suspicion in South America and elsewhere is becoming painfully apparent.

(3) Our long coast line bears no relation to our need of battle-ships. Every inch of it is protected by either fortifications or the agreement at The Hague in 1907 that no unfortified place can be bombarded, but that landing of troops may be prevented by planting mines. Of Great Britain and France we have no fear, as they stand ready for a complete arbitration treaty. Germany and Japan, even if they had a quarrel with us, as they have not, would, with the old enemies in their rear, commit national suicide were they to attack us.

(4) Our dangers from within are as extreme as they are negligible from without. The military lobbyists and alarmists wholly ignore them in their clamor that their interests alone shall receive attention. They want more armor-plate, and what care they that 35,000 citizens perished last year and half a million were maimed in our industrial warfare? They want more guns that cost $700 a shot at target practice and can give only 250 discharges. This makes money for gun and powder makers. What care they for the 150,000 who died last year of preventable tuberculosis, of the 25,000 that died of preventable typhoid, and the $100,000,000 which typhoid cost us? They want more $15,000,000 battle-ships to fight purely supposititious foes and to keep up our naval prestige, when in every land where there are newspapers our moral prestige has sunk, and our lynchings, our McNamaras, our graft in high places, our Becker trials, and our Bleases have lost us honor which it will take something besides battle-ships to retrieve.

(5) The navy craze has become an obsession with the 727 active and retired army and navy officers who, said Justice Brewer, "live in Washington and are making a military center of our National capital." They know how to bring pressure to bear on the men at the Capitol and White House. They would reverse the normal order of things, and put our greatest expenditure where it is least needed, and our least expenditure where there is most danger. The people of this country are beginning to see through the sophistry. Would our press but give all the pertinent facts in their true relation, we should compel Congress this winter not to add $40,000,000 to our equipment for fighting bogies, but should put it into the real defense of American lives. LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Boston.

[The assumption that those who want an adequate navy care nothing for public honesty and social justice is without the support of fact or reason. It is a common sophistry to say that it is wrong to spend money on one thing because money ought to be spent on another. If an adequate navy is wrong, let us refuse to have one; if it is right and desirable, let us have it, and let us also fight lynching, graft, disease, and corruption with all our might.—THE EDITORS.]

CAMP-FIRE GIRLS IN DISTANT LAOS

The following note about Laos Camp-Fire Girls is taken from a copy of the little quarterly "The Laos News," which reports the work of the Presbyterian missionaries in northern Siam. It may interest the Camp-Fire Girls in America. Miss Buck is one of the missionaries at Chiengmai, the first and largest center of work among the Lao people.

Brooklyn, New York. E. BERTHA BRADLEY.

In a recent number of The Outlook we read an article on that very practicable and popular organization at home called "The Camp-Fire Girls," and the idea at once suggested itself to start an adaptation of the club among our Laos girls. At a social we gave our school-girls we told them of the idea, and they were delighted with it; so plans were immediately begun.

All the time we were planning we were wondering what the promoters in America would think of our audacity in pouncing upon plans that they had worked on for over a year without saying so much as "by your leave." If we have greatly sinned against them, we crave their pardon. We were quite too eager to begin, to wait four long months for a reply from headquarters, so we "took the bit in our teeth" and bolted.

Our organization, that is starting off with a membership of twenty-three, is still too much of an infant to say how it will grow, but we hope that the carrying out of the law—"Seek beauty," "Give service," "Pursue knowledge," "Be trustworthy," "Hold on to health," "Glorify work," "Be happy"—which we have translated into Lao, will help to develop our Laos Christian girls into a noble womanhood capable of mak-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing homes in the true sense of that beautiful word. We also hope it will be the means of keeping us in helpful touch with those of our girls who, being motherless, have to leave school early to take up the mother's place.

The list of practical things which must be mastered before taking the second degree of Fire-Makers will, with revision to make it practical here, be a most helpful course in domestic training for these coming home-makers of Siam. We are hoping great things.

EDITH M. BUCK.

HOW A UNIVERSITY HONORS FARMERS

A unique but little-known work being done by the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin is the official recognition of practical farmers. This institution is the only university in the world that presents a few successful farmers each year with engraved testimonials, signed by the President of the University, the President of the University Board of Regents, and the Dean of the College of Agriculture, in recognition of their services to practical agriculture.

Academic learning plays absolutely no part in the selection of the men honored, which is a radical departure from all university traditions. The weather-beaten farmer whose entire education consists of two or three winters at the district school, but whose native intelligence, perseverance, and qualities of leadership have forced him to a place in the front rank of agriculturists, is given as good a chance for recognition as the college man. The college man is not discriminated against—two of the twelve honored thus far have been college graduates—but an effort is made to show the world that ability and accomplishment can come through other lines than scholastic ones. It proves that the holder of a college degree is not always the worthiest man in a community.

The first recognition exercises took place in February, 1909, during the ten days' farmers' course, which is an annual event held at the University for the benefit of farmers who want to keep abreast of the times. The three men honored at that time were Henry Wallace, of Des Moines, Iowa, editor of a well-known agricultural paper; C. P. Goodrich, of Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin; and A. L. Hatch, of Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin. Of these three men, Mr. Wallace was the only one who held a college degree.

Now a word as to the reasons for selecting these men. Mr. Wallace was accorded the honor because of the uplift which he has brought to agriculture, not only through his editorials and books, but through his lectures, simple talks to farmers, and actual demonstrations of how farm conditions can be improved. Mr. Goodrich was nearly sixty years old before he rose above the level of a mediocre, unknown farmer. His first appearance in public showed a timid, self-conscious, middle-aged farmer reading a carefully written paper from which he never raised his eyes. After a time the paper was put aside and his listeners found him an interesting, intensely practical, and powerful speaker. His particular field is dairying, and now there is probably no man in the country who is more in demand for lectures on this subject. He is a recognized authority on the feed and care of the dairy cow. To Mr. Hatch belongs the honor of introducing a new industry into Wisconsin, for he was the first man to recognize the orcharding possibilities of what is known as the "Sturgeon Bay country." This big peninsula is now one vast orchard. All Mr. Hatch has done has been accomplished in spite of difficulties that many men would have declared insurmountable, because for over twenty years he has been a hopeless invalid.

In 1910 the three men awarded certificates of recognition were Seaman A. Knapp, of the United States Bureau of Plant Industry, whose energetic way of developing the resources of the South has attracted considerable attention among agriculturists; George C. Hill, of Rosendale, Wisconsin, one of the foremost cattle-breeders in the State; and Herman A. Briggs, of Delavan, Wisconsin, one of the best-known horse-breeders. As in the previous year, only one of the men honored, Mr. Knapp, was a college graduate.

The following year only two men were awarded recognition at the annual exercises. One, William Toole, of Baraboo, Wisconsin, is known as the "pansy king." For over thirty-five years he has been growing pansies, and, as a result of his careful work, Wisconsin is one of the few places where you can get seed that grows pansies bigger than silver dollars. The other, Alexander Galbraith, of Janesville, Wisconsin, was one of the first farmers to attempt to improve the quality of farm horses, and he has worked hard for every law regarding pure-bred live stock on the Wisconsin statute-books.

This year recognition was awarded to ex-Governor W. D. Hoard, of Fort Atkinson, "the best-loved man in Wisconsin;" Alexander A. Arnold, of Galesville, Wisconsin; and Charles W. and William W. Marsh, of Illinois.

Probably no one man has ever done more for the farmers of Wisconsin than Mr. Hoard. He is a very old man now, but his love and enthusiasm for the State are as strong as in the days when he traveled from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi, and from Lake Superior to the southern boundary of the State, in every sort of weather, pleading with the obstinate foreign farmers who held so doggedly to their inefficient, wasteful methods of agriculture. It took years to teach them that the Governor was not a meddlesome crank. Mr. Arnold was one of the pioneers in the "farmers' institute" movement. In the days when practical farmers scoffed at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"book farmers" from the agricultural college, and derided their attempts to place agriculture on a scientific basis, Mr. Arnold went about among his neighbors and friends patiently explaining and pointing out why they needed the help of experts. Now there are over one hundred and fifty farmers' institutes conducted in the State each winter. The Marsh brothers, two bent old men who are spending their last years in a little town in Illinois, were the inventors of the first harvesting-machine. Because of the vast amount of labor the harvester has saved farmers the University of Wisconsin thought it only fitting that its inventors should receive some acknowledgment.

That these honorary certificates are not honorary college degrees, but something entirely new and original, is a fact the University authorities always make plain. Every college in the country can grant an honorary degree, but the University of Wisconsin is the only institution that grants a certificate of recognition. In establishing these honors the University simply wants to prove to the world that there are men in agriculture, men without so-called "education," who are worthy of recognition. Moreover, it is not the rich "city" farmer, the moneyed man who spends some of his surplus wealth to maintain a farm as a hobby, that is entitled to these honors. It is the dyed-in-the-wool farmer who lives on his farm year in and year out, who loves every inch of the country for its own sake, and who is doing something for agriculture besides making money.

That the faculty and regents of the University of Wisconsin were big enough to relinquish their academic traditions—always a hard thing with schoolmen—was something of which the whole Nation can be proud. It was a noble, if bold, thing to do, for it was a tacit admission that the principles of democracy are as applicable to higher education and institutions of higher education as to anything else in this country.

E. B. MORRISON.

University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

STATE INSURANCE IN WISCONSIN AND ITALY

State insurance is a new thing in this country. In 1911 Commissioner of Insurance Herman L. Ekern began the agitation for State insurance in Wisconsin. The proposition appealed strongly to the people, and a law creating State insurance was finally adopted, and has recently become effective. Within a few weeks Commissioner Ekern, of the Wisconsin Insurance Department, has been besieged with applications for insurance. Some three hundred applications have been written, and the Department will continue to write them, but the policies will not be issued before December 1 next, when from five hundred to one thousand will be issued at the same time. A majority of the applications are written in the sum of $1,000.

The State of Iowa is also considering the matter of State insurance, and a Legislative Committee appointed for that purpose has reported favorably for the adoption of State insurance in Iowa.

In 1911 William H. Hotchkiss, when Superintendent of Insurance of New York, in an address before the Life Insurance Presidents' Association, called attention to certain things which the old-line life companies should do for the benefit of the policy-holders, and he intimated that in case they failed to do so, State insurance would be the inevitable result in the not far distant future. Hence State insurance is attracting much attention among thinking men and legislators in many States.

A few weeks ago the press contained an interesting report of the adoption of government insurance in Italy. When the bill was first proposed there was much opposition from the American life insurance companies which did a large business in Italy, and also the home companies of that country. Government insurance in Italy went into effect January 1, 1913. The Italian law provides that the surviving insurance companies of that country may operate only under a tariff prescribed by the Government, but they cannot make deductions in any amount to their clients, not even in the shape of private restitution of taxes paid to the Government, under the penalty of having their authorization to do business immediately revoked. In a few years the Italian government monopoly of life insurance will be complete.

Buffalo, New York. W. A. RICE.

MR. BEECHER'S INFLUENCE FOR PEACE

I read with great pleasure the article in The Outlook of January 4 entitled "One Hundred Years of Peace," in which the author discusses some very important matters and many not so important bearing upon the feeling of the English people with regard to the affairs of the United States during our Civil War. But one of the most important events, and one which seemed to have had a greater influence in molding the feelings of the common people of England in our favor than any other, has been entirely overlooked. I allude to the incident of Henry Ward Beecher's visit to England under the direction of President Lincoln to interpret personally to the people the position and standing of the United States in the war, and prove to them how entirely they had misinterpreted the whole situation and how unjustly they were criticising our Government.

No one who was familiar with the tone of the press during those stirring times can forget the accounts of the great change which came over the minds and hearts of the people of England in our favor, caused by Mr. Beecher's convincing speeches.

A SUBSCRIBER.

Roselle Park, New Jersey.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BY THE WAY

The London "Economist" figures the cost of the Balkan war, for 64 days' fighting, at $152,000,000, or about $2,500,000 a day. This is based on the expense of maintaining 1,000,000 men in the field, at $2.50 per day each. During our time of storm and stress in the Civil War the expenditures of the North alone were estimated at $2,000,000 a day.

Sixty-four days seems a short time in which to shatter utterly the power and prestige of the Turkish Empire. It will be remembered, however, that in the Franco-German War—the most recent European war between two first-class Powers—just one month elapsed between Napoleon III's attack on the heights of Saarbruck and his capitulation at Sedan.

The use of concrete has greatly simplified and, durability considered, correspondingly cheapened ice-house construction, says an agricultural paper. A modern ice-house of this kind can be built for $200. But, whether of concrete or boards, a good ice-house is becoming an indispensable luxury on most farms.

Few natural products escape imitation by ingenious inventors. Now we have a metallic sponge, consisting of a "loose-meshed network inclosing spaces of larger or smaller size." It is made of an alloy of lead and antimony, and is used for absorbing resins, oils, etc.

The saddle-horse at least, according to "Rider and Driver," is not being displaced by the motor car. The latter, indeed, makes its obeisance to the horse in a curious way. "It is no uncommon sight," says the journal quoted, "to see two or three streets surrounding Durland's Riding Academy or the Central Park Riding Academy, or any of the riding and driving clubs, crowded with automobiles whose horse-owning proprietors are within doors watching their pets, or riding themselves."

American paper money is so superior to that of most other countries that Germany, Greece, and Brazil are reported to have lately considered or resolved upon the adoption of our methods in producing such money. China, under the new régime, is, it is said, actually having its notes printed in this country.

Justice Goff, of New York, deserves the thanks of the United States Navy for his remarks in sentencing a wayward youth who pleaded that, if let off, he would join the navy. "The navy," the Judge said, "does not want men of your class. The time has gone by when we can use the navy for reformatory purposes. Our navy is composed of self-respecting young men."

Colorado is said to have $750,000 lying idle in the State Treasury. There are so many good uses to which such a sum might be put that perhaps congratulations are uncalled for. Highway improvement is suggested, naturally enough, by "Good Roads." Perhaps the "School Journal" or the "Electrical Review" or the "American Art Journal" could also offer suggestions as to what to do with the surplus.

An exchange credits a Scotchman with this pun (which has an Irish flavor): On a very cold day a Highlander, who still wore the kilt, was asked by a modernized fellow-clansman, "Sandy, are ye no' cauld wi' the kilt?" "Na, na," replied the loyal Sandy, "but I'm near kilt wi' the cauld."

"Noblesse oblige" is evidently the motto of the Queen of England, for she is said almost constantly to be seen with knitting-needles in hand, making articles of comfort that she contributes to the London Needlework Guild.

Mr. Gatti-Casazza, the general manager of the Metropolitan Opera-House in New York City, says that operas must be sung in the language in which they are written, because, for one reason, tenors are rare and are becoming rarer, and they will not relearn their parts in English. So widely distributed are fine voices, says this authority, that in the Metropolitan's company there are an Armenian and a New Zealander.

The ardent enthusiasm of a woman of genius is illustrated in a remark of Rachel, the famous French actress, to Alfred de Musset, as quoted in a newly discovered (or rediscovered) letter published in the "Atlantic." Rachel was reading a volume of Racine, and exclaimed: "How I love this man! When I put my nose into this book I could forget to eat and to drink for two days and two nights!" Her reading aloud de Musset describes as inspired.

India, the land of contradictions, has different opinions even as to the worth of female children, as may be seen in this passage from the recently published autobiography of Nawab Sultan Jahan Begam, ruler of Bhopal, on the birth of a granddaughter: "The eldest child of the holy Prophet was his daughter Fatimah; and hence every pious Musalman regards himself as specially favored when his first-born is a girl. . . . It seemed like a decree of Providence, and my son's joy was as great as my own."

Richard Wagner's autograph score of the "Rule Britannia" Overture was recently sold in England, and, as might be expected, was regarded as a prize by collectors. A large number of autograph letters from George Meredith, covering a period of nearly fifty years, were also the subject of lively bidding at the same sale.

A German newspaper recently conducted a symposium which decided that the man of fifty is at the high-water mark of efficiency. Many famous men contributed to the symposium, but, strangely enough, their own ages are not included in the reports of the verdict reached. With almost every healthy, normal man, the feeling is probably spontaneous that he is at present, no matter what his age, at the height of his mental powers. At any rate, this is a wholesome spirit to cultivate.

The original Wild West show, says a writer in the "Dramatic Mirror," was produced back in the '70s, in the form of a play by Ned Buntline called "The Scouts of the Plains." Almost the sole surviving scout, Buffalo Bill, appeared in this early play; but its star was "Wild Bill," a prince of melodrama, says his enthusiastic eulogist, compared with whom Homer's heroes were merely ruffians!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED